NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

The Rt. Hon.ble Sir Robert Peel, Bart.

&c. &c.

London. Fisher and Blackett

MEMOIRS

OF THE

COURTS AND CABINETS

OF

WILLIAM IV. AND VICTORIA.

FROM ORIGINAL FAMILY DOCUMENTS.

BY

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS
K.G.

37267

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
HURST AND BLACKETT, PUBLISHERS,
SUCCESSORS TO HENRY COLBURN,
13, GREAT MARLBOROUGH STREET.
1861.

The right of Translation is reserved.

00037267

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME.

CHAPTER I.

[1832.]

Revolutionary Movement in France—Eton Montem—Radical Dissatisfaction—The Duke of Wellington's Opinion of the State of the Nation—Attack on the Duke—Assault on the King—Violent Language in the House of Commons—Commotion in Paris—Sir James Mackintosh—Jeremy Bentham—Parliamentary Proceedings—English and French Demonstration against Holland—Civil War in Portugal—Tour of the Princess Victoria—General Election—Sir Walter Scott . . . . . pp. 1—29

CHAPTER II.

[1833.]

Election of Speaker—Opening of Parliament—The King's Speech—Its Effect upon Mr. O'Connell and the Repealers—Parliamentary Proceedings—The Duke of Wellington's Reserve—Pitiable State of the Irish Clergy—Changes in the Government—Compliment to the Duke of Wellington—First Sign of Reaction—Reduction of the Malt Duty—Majority against Ministers—They lose ground in Popular Favour—Estimate of Louis Philippe—Radical Movement in England—Duke of Wellington's Motion respecting the Civil War in Portugal—Majority against Ministers in both Houses—Prorogation of Parliament—Testimonials to Reformers, pp. 31—58

CHAPTER III.

[1833-4.]

The Princess Victoria—Affairs in France—Incendiarism in England—Death of Lord Grenville—Estimate of his Character and Political Services — Contrast between 1795 and 1833 — The Duke of Wellington elected Chancellor of the University of Oxford—His Opinion of the Government and of the House of Commons — Commencement of the Second Session of the Reformed Parliament —Mr. Sheil and Lord Althorp in the Custody of Sergeant-at-Arms —Ministers in a Minority—Combinations of Workmen—Strikes—Illegal Oaths and Mummeries—Despotism of Trades Unions—The Duke of Wellington evinces more Activity . . . . pp. 59—88

CHAPTER IV.

[1834.]

Insurrection at Lyons—Conservative Action in England—The Duke of Cumberland's Description of a Political Festival—Disunion in the Cabinet — Ministerial Changes — Negotiations — Addresses to the King respecting the State of the Church of England—Installation of the Duke of Wellington at Oxford — Musical Festival in Westminster Abbey—Resignation of Lord Althorp and Earl Grey —Lord Althorp returns to Office, and Reconstruction of the Whig Ministry . . . . . pp. 89—110

CHAPTER V.

[1834.]

The Duke of Wellington exhibits more Political Activity—Meetings of Conservative Peers at Apsley House—Their Intentions described by the Duke of Cumberland and the Marquis of Londonderry—Prorogation of Parliament—Assassination excited by Trades Unions —Radical Demonstration at Edinburgh—Lord Durham at Wynyard Park—His Portrait—Conflagration of the Houses of Parliament—Increase of Incendiarism—Deaths of Illustrious Men—State of the Government . . . . . pp. 111—133

CHAPTER VI.

[1834.]

Proceedings of the Government Commissioners sent to inquire into the Operation of the Poor Laws—Death of Earl Spencer—The King dismisses his Ministers—Sir Robert Peel sent for—The Duke of Wellington accepts a Temporary Appointment — The Duke's Description of the Dissolution of the late Government—Death of H.R.H. the Duke of Gloucester—H.R.H. the Duke of Cumberland's Opinions on the State of Affairs—Construction of Sir Robert Peel's Administration—Announcement of his Policy—Opposition of Whigs and Radicals . . . . . pp. 135—155

CHAPTER VII.

[1835.]

Sir Robert Peel and Lord Eldon—Result of the Elections—The Whigs and Radicals elect a New Speaker of the House of Commons—The King's Speech—Debate on the Address—Scenes in Parliament—Motion for the Repeal of the Malt Tax—Political Incubation—Demonstration of the Reformers—Majority against the Government —Resignation of Ministers—Liberal Encouragement afforded by the late Government to Literature and Science—The New Whig Cabinet — Their Difficulties — Infamous Placard — Motion for the Reduction of Taxation—Vote by Ballot—Civil War in Spain, pp. 157—187

CHAPTER VIII.

[1835.]

Parliamentary Proceedings—The Government defeated in the House of Lords — Installation of the Knights of the Garter — The Whig Commissioners of Inquiry — Meeting of Conservatives — Political Speculations—Radical Crusade against Orange Lodges—Bad News from Spain—Treatment of the Government Measures by the House of Lords — Approaching Collision between the Two Houses'— Meeting at Apsley House—Proceedings of Sir Robert Peel—Prorogation of Parliament—O'Connell and Lord Mulgrave, pp. 189—211

CHAPTER IX.

[1836.]

Deplorable State of France — Infernal-Machine Explosion — Severe Restrictions imposed by the French Government—Whig Liberality in England — Parliamentary Proceedings — Lord Sidmouth's Surrender of his Pension — The Duke of Cumberland and the Clamour against the Orange Lodges — Debate on the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill—View of Political Affairs—Revolting Features in the Civil War in Spain—Humane Interposition of the Marquis of Londonderry—Debates in the Lords on the Government Measures — Charge of selling a Borough brought against Mr. O'Connell—He is supported by the Government—Distress of the Agricultural Interest—Treatment of the Ministerial Measures by the House of Peers . . . . . pp. 213—245

CHAPTER X.

[1837.]

Louis Philippe again shot at — Louis Napoleon at Strasburg — Sir Robert Peel elected Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow—Proposed Equestrian Statue to the Duke of Wellington—Constitution of the House of Commons—The Whigs resume their attempts at Legislation — Sir Robert Peel and the New Poor Law — The Government Measure respecting Church Rates—Their Proceedings in Spain — Their Defeats in the Lords — Public Meetings in Opposition to the Government—Death of the King—Estimate of the Character of William IV. by Lord Melbourne, the Duke of Wellington, Earl Grey, and Sir Robert Peel — Account by the Archbishop of Canterbury of the King's Last Moments — His Family—His Funeral—The Duke of Cumberland becomes King of Hanover . . . . . pp. 247—277

CHAPTER XI.

[1837.]

Accession to the Throne of the Princess Victoria—First Assembly of the Privy Council in presence of the Queen — Taking the Oaths — Formation of the Ministry and the Royal Household—Result of the

General Election—The Queen and Lord Melbourne—Prospects of Party—The King of Hanover—Meeting of Parliament—Conservative Tactics—The Queen's State Visit to the City—Parliamentary Proceedings—Correspondence of the King of Hanover—Retirement of Lords Eldon, Sidmouth, and Wellesley — Death of Lord Clancarty . . . . . pp. 279—302

CHAPTER XII.

[1838.]

The Canadian Revolt—M. Papineau and the Rebels—Appointment of the Earl of Durham as Governor-General of the Colony—Parliamentary Proceedings respecting Canada—Lord Brougham attacks, and the Duke of Wellington defends, the Government—Dissatisfaction of the Conservatives at the Duke's Conduct — Lord Melbourne's Position—Debates in both Houses—Charge against Mr. O'Connell — He is reprimanded by the Speaker — Radical Attack on Lord Glenelg—Conservative Attack on Ministers—Their Defeat in the Lords — Liberal Attack on the Copyright Bill — Meeting at Apsley House—Frequent Defeats of the Government, pp. 303—331

CHAPTER XIII.

[1838.]

Coronation of the Queen—An Abbreviated Ceremony resolved upon—Interest taken in the Spectacle—The Procession—Arrangements in the Abbey—The Royal Family and Great Officers of State—The Queen—The Ladies of the Court—The Act of Homage—A New Crown—Entertainments in honour of the occasion—Allowance to the Duke of Sussex—Majority in the House of Lords against the Government—Marshal Soult's Visit—Creations—The Lords again defeat the Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Bill by large Majorities —Illegal Acts of Lord Durham in Canada—Debates on the Subject in both Houses—Prorogation of Parliament—Rise of Chartism—The Birmingham and the Manchester School of Politics—Visit of the King and Queen of the Belgians—Second Rebellion in Canada —Invasions of the Colony defeated — Repressive Policy of the Whigs—State of Affairs in India described by Sir Gore Ouseley—Views of Russia in Central Asia . . . . . pp. 333—369

CHAPTER XIV.

[1839.]

The Queen's Speech — Mr. Thomas Duncombe and the Chartist Delegates—Debates on the Corn Laws in both Houses—Mr. Hume and his New Reform Bill—Government defeated in the House of Peers—Debate on Lord John Russell's Motion in the Commons of Confidence in Ministers, and on the Jamaica Bill—Resignation of the Government—The Duke of Wellington Consulted by the Queen —Sir Robert Peel sent for—Arrangements for a new Administration completed—The Queen advised by her late Ministers not to part with the Ladies of the Household—Communications between her Majesty and Sir Robert Peel—The Whig Government resume Office — Curious Explanations — Extraordinary Minute of the Reinstated Ministers in Cabinet—Alarming Chartist Demonstrations —The Eglintoun Tournament—Increase of Disaffection in France, pp. 371—398

CHAPTER XV.

[1840-60.]

Chartist Rising defeated—Marriage of the Queen — Question of Privilege — "Stockdale *versus* Hansard" — Ministers pronounced "very culpable"—Louis Napoleon and France—Agitation against the Corn Laws — Unpopularity of the Government — General Election in favour of the Conservatives—Sir Robert Peel forms an Administration — Anti-Corn-Law League — Prosecution of Mr. O'Connell—Marquis of Londonderry appointed Ambassador at St. Petersburg—Political Hostility—Deaths of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel—Revival of Conservatism—Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton—Decline of Whig Popularity—Extraordinary Qualifications of Lord Palmerston—Defeat of the New Reform Bill—Prospect of the Country . . . . . pp. 399—429

CHAPTER I.

[1832.]

REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN FRANCE—ETON MONTEM—RADICAL DISSATISFACTION—THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON'S OPINION OF THE STATE OF THE NATION—ATTACK ON THE DUKE—ASSAULT ON THE KING—VIOLENT LANGUAGE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—COMMOTION IN PARIS—SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH—JEREMY BENTHAM—PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS—ENGLISH AND FRENCH DEMONSTRATION AGAINST HOLLAND—CIVIL WAR IN PORTUGAL—TOUR OF THE PRINCESS VICTORIA—GENERAL ELECTION—SIR WALTER SCOTT.

CHAPTER I.

The state of France appeared to be growing worse and worse every month. In La Vendée and the western provinces, the Duchess de Berri, calling herself Regent of France, had been exciting the population to demonstrations in favour of her son, styled by her, Henri I. In Paris there was unquestionable rebellion, and a sanguinary conflict of the people with the military, that lasted during the 5th and 6th of June; barricades were formed, and desperate fighting was continued at several points. The insurgents at first gained some successes over the National Guard and the troops of the line, but were finally repulsed, after much blood had been shed on both sides. Subsequently, that very excitable body of young gentlemen belonging to the Ecole Polytechnique were dismissed to their homes, and the school dissolved; various corps of the National Guard that had misconducted themselves, disarmed; Paris declared in a state of siege, and persons who had taken part in the insurrection, tried by court martial and sentenced to the galleys.

Subsequently, however, on appeal the Court of Cassation quashed the proceedings, a result that gave great satisfaction to the Parisians, and it was found necessary to dissolve the state of siege by royal ordinance.

On the 12th of June, their Majesties proceeded to Eton College to witness the celebration of the Montem, a pageant to which George III. was particularly partial. As this has been discontinued for some years (and is not likely to be revived), it may be necessary to state that it was a procession of the scholars from the College to Salt Hill, dressed in various fancy costumes, as well as in naval and military uniforms. The general effect was extremely picturesque, and invariably attracted a vast assemblage of people of rank and fashion, in their equipages and on horseback. The object of the Montem was to collect a subscription for the benefit of the captain of the school, or head boy on the foundation, to assist him in prosecuting his studies at Cambridge; and during the procession the spectators were appealed to by scholars appointed for that purpose, and the contributions thus obtained were called "salt." This usually amounted to a considerable sum; on the present occasion it reached 1200*l.*, and the fortunate captain was the son of Mr. Williams, the bookseller of Eton.

Parliament continued its sittings, the Irish Reform Bill attracting most attention in the House

of Commons; the discussions producing several divisions, which were in favour of Ministers, despite of active opposition from Mr. O'Connell. The opinions of the Duke of Wellington at this period are thus expressed.

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

London, June 23, 1832.

My dear Duke,

I quite concur with you respecting the symptoms of the times of the last week. They have occasioned a little apprehension in London and elsewhere; but the impression is only temporary. It is not in my power to prevent the consequences of the mischief which has been done. The Government of England is destroyed. A Parliament will be returned, by means of which no set of men whatever will be able to conduct the administration of affairs, and to protect the lives and properties of the King's subjects.

I hear the worst accounts of the elections; indeed, I don't believe that gentlemen will be prevailed upon to offer themselves as candidates.

It has been reported within these few days, that the Ministers intend to propose to prorogue Parliament, and to have another session in October. If this should be true, they will not pass the Irish Reform Bill or their Tithe Bill this session.

I believe that they are embarrassed about their foreign affairs. They are upon the point of a war with Holland; indeed, there is war already, unless Holland should submit to be blockaded. It appears to me that they are

desirous that Parliament should not be sitting during the crisis that must take place between the two countries.

There is certainly something very extraordinary in their mode of conducting their business, and particularly their supplies.

I wait to see how the Irish Bill comes out of the Commons, before I decide upon the course which I will follow.

Believe me, ever yours most sincerely,

WELLINGTON.

H. G. the Duke of Buckingham, K.G., &c.

The influence of cajolery had not been so comprehensive as had been desired. As soon as the Radicals calmed down a little from the excitement which their triumph, as they considered it, had produced, they began to look a little more closely into the objects and intentions of the party they had thus assisted to maintain in power, and observing nothing therein that indicated any particular association with their objects and intentions, they exhibited much dissatisfaction.

A knowledge of the obligations the Government lay under to them, made them sensible of its weakness and their strength; consequently they grew bolder in their demands, and more violent in their language. Their organizations and combinations were ostentatiously displayed, and although their opposition to the Conservative leaders had abated nothing of its fierceness, they did not care to con-

ceal the facility with which, if provoked, they could include in it their ostensible friends and patrons.

The Duke of Wellington was an attentive observer of the signs of the times, and drew from them the most discouraging conclusions; but nothing could well be more gloomy than the prospect of affairs both at home and abroad; nothing more clearly apparent than the inability of the Government to deal with either as the exigencies of the case demanded.

Another experienced Minister was also a deeply interested spectator of the hazardous game now being played with the interests of a great nation. Lord Eldon, writing to Lord Stowell about the middle of the month, says:—

"It should seem now to be obvious that the political unions have found themselves strong enough to teach Lord Grey that his reliance on the good sense of the people is downright nonsense. They avow that they will force universal suffrage, vote by ballot, pledges from candidates to promote all their objects, rendering the members pure delegates; and that nobility, or at least hereditary nobility, shall no longer exist."[1]

The fact was, the political unions knew that they had restored the Ministers to power, and consequently felt confident that they would be permitted to proceed on their own particular course unchecked.

[1] Twiss, "Life."

The temper of that class of the population for whom ostensibly such extraordinary exertions had been made by the friends of the Government, was displayed on the anniversary of the battle of Waterloo, when the hero of this greatest of decisive victories, on returning from the Tower on horseback, was hissed, hooted, pelted, and nearly unhorsed. This brutal attack continued till his Grace obtained the protection of a large body of police; they saw him safe into Apsley House, the windows of which the Duke had had furnished with iron shutters at a considerable expense, as a protection to his property.

"The doctrine of No king is reviving here," writes Lord Eldon to his brother; "to which is added, what Queen Charlotte in George III.'s time escaped, 'No queen.' The unions all over the country are issuing their proclamations for further revolutionary measures. They receive neither check nor punishment."[1]

On the 19th the King went to Ascot races, and was seated on the grand stand when a stone, thrown with considerable violence, struck his Majesty on the forehead—a forcible commentary on the "No king" doctrine. The offender proved to be a discharged Greenwich pensioner, who, having petitioned without success, and probably read some of the appeals to physical force that were in circulation, by this outrage chose to show his indignation. He

[1] Twiss, "Life."

was subsequently tried for the offence and convicted, but sentence was deferred. These assaults on the Duke of Wellington and on the King, following each other within twenty-four hours, displayed the spirit that political agitation had excited.

On the 29th of June the Earl of Roden brought the attention of the House of Lords to the deplorable state of Ireland. The Duke of Wellington stated that the disturbances in the worst periods of Irish history were thrown into the shade by what was now passing in that country. He said it was the duty of the Government to protect property, and that the treatment of the Protestants by the Government must lead either to a Catholic Government or a separation from England. Lord Melbourne and the Marquis of Lansdowne seemed to think that nothing could be done, and Lord Roden's motion for a Committee of Inquiry was negatived by a majority of 120 to 79.[1]

The Marquis of Londonderry then made some inquiries affecting the foreign policy of Ministers, which brought from Earl Grey a disapproval of the language that had been used "in another place," but no answer to the question.

The fact was, the privilege of speech both in Parliament and elsewhere had recently been greatly abused. Some public men seemed to have entirely lost sight of the propriety of weighing their words before they expressed them, and had entered into a

[1] Hansard.

rivalry of mischievous declamation, more in the school of the French Convention of the last century than of any approved example of British oratory. The Government was too feeble to place any check upon such oratory; indeed, its most zealous supporters were among the worst offenders in this direction. They were persons of education and position, who ought to have known better, but were led away by aspirations for popularity, as a means of political elevation, that made them quite regardless of the tendency of their speeches.

In the House of Commons at the same time there were several displays of this kind, most of them made with reference to future success at the hustings, or with a view to a larger amount of influence in the Government. Members of noble families came forward as rivals to the ordinary demagogues, and seemed striving to introduce into the British Legislature the language and tactics of "the Mountain" of the French Assembly.[1] But the result was entirely different. The repetition of such democratic declarations made them less and less alarming; the terrible suggestions at last frightened nobody; and familiarity, as is usual, bred contempt. The true character of these manifestations became evident to every person of ordinary penetration—the monster turned out to be a scarecrow.

Several eminent men died about this period, both

[1] See the Reports of the Parliamentary Debates and of Public Meetings.

in France and England. The King of the French lost his able Minister, Casimir Perier, who died of the epidemic then prevalent in both countries. He had realized a large fortune as a banker and manufacturer, and consequently possessed to a considerable extent the confidence of the bourgeoisie. He was, however, moderate in his principles, and an advocate of peace, which he endeavoured to preserve while in office. He was succeeded by Marshal Soult, the Minister of War.

A much greater man was lost to society on the same day in Paris, who was a loss not only to France, but to Europe. This was Baron Cuvier, to whose researches in comparative anatomy, natural history owes the greatest obligations. He was seized with paralysis at the age of sixty-three. About a fortnight afterwards died General Lamarque, a distinguished soldier of the Republic and the Empire, who had so strongly recommended himself to the Republicans, that at his funeral an immense concourse assembled, in which, among the population of Paris, figured peers, deputies, national guards, and artillery, and a large concourse of foreign exiles. But these elements did not agree—a quarrel took place between the *amis du peuple* and a regiment of dragoons, which was fomented by the demagogues into a sanguinary conflict, in which the boys of the Polytechnic School took a prominent part. Barricades were raised, and an attack on the military continued with great fury amid tumultuous cries of

"Aux armes," "A bas Louis Philippe," and "Vive la République." The result was, when order was restored, about a thousand persons had been killed or wounded. The presses of the newspapers were stopped, and other acts committed by the King, of a character more arbitrary than those which had lost Charles X. his crown.[1]

On the 30th of May died at his house in London, Sir James Mackintosh. He was born in Scotland of respectable parents, and educated there for the medical profession; and having taken his degree at Edinburgh, proceeded to London with the intention of commencing practice. Politics appear to have had more attraction for him than physic, and he commenced his career with a pamphlet in support of Mr. Fox's idea of the unlimited succession to the Regency of the Prince of Wales. In 1791 appeared his "Vindiciæ Gallicæ," a much more imposing performance, written in the style of Edmund Burke, whose arguments on the same subject it opposed. This powerfully recommended the writer to the leaders of the Opposition, and he turned his back upon the Faculty, and addressed himself to the study of the law with a view to political advancement. Having qualified himself to practise as a barrister, he joined the Home circuit in 1795; but his political principles underwent a change.

By this time he had married. His wife was the

[1] French journals.

sister of two brothers, one of whom was proprietor of a newspaper in the interest of Fox, the other superintended one in the interest of Pitt. These were *The Oracle* and *Morning Post;* and Mackintosh, on the testimony of Dr. Parr,[1] wrote leading articles for each. It was clear that he had no intention of following the example of Burke—now one of his intimate friends—as expressed in the well-known line of Goldsmith,

> And to party give up what was meant for mankind.

With an even-handed justice, if he advanced Tory principles one day, he exhibited his perfect independence the next, by being as eloquent an advocate for the Whigs. He also wrote much for the *Monthly Review;* in short, his practice as a barrister now being very much what his practice as a physician had been, he became a hard-working *littérateur*, writing articles for the newspapers of his brothers, Peter and Daniel Stuart, indifferent to the complexion of their politics, or criticisms for the Reviews with as little regard for the character of the books he examined.[2] He was appointed Professor of General Polity and the Laws, at the East India College, Hertford. He also gave lectures at Lincoln's Inn; one introductory to a course on the Law of Nature and Nations was much admired by Mr. Pitt, who used his influence with Lord Sidmouth to obtain for him the post of

[1] *Law Magazine*, xvii. 166. [2] Wade's "British History."

Recorder of Bombay; and he consequently proceeded to India, where he remained eight years, fulfilling his legal duties.

Sir James Mackintosh (for he had been knighted), returned to England in the year 1812, when he refused an appointment offered him by Mr. Perceval, stating at the time—"It has long been my fixed determination not to go into public life on any terms inconsistent with the principles of liberty, which are now higher in my mind than they were twenty years ago."[1]

He obtained a seat in the House of Commons for Nairn, in 1813. He was brought into Parliament by the Duke of Devonshire, for Knaresborough, in 1818, and remained the member of that borough for thirteen years. Subsequently he continued to act with that party, with commendable fidelity, till Earl Grey became Prime Minister; he was then included in his Administration, but in the subordinate post he had refused eighteen years before. He spoke well on the Reform Bill; but, like similar preceding displays, it assumed the appearance of an oration that had its source rather in the library than the Senate.

Sir James had always shown a tendency towards theory in preference to argument; many years before, Madame de Staël had given him the name of "Mr. Harmony," from his fondness for smoothing

[1] "Memoirs of Sir James Mackintosh." By his Son. ii. 246.

inequalities of principle, and arranging differences of opinion. She admired his forensic talents, but considered him deficient in genius. This verdict would perhaps, by rigid critics, be confirmed by a calm review of his works and speeches. His "Life of Sir Thomas More" is the most pleasing of his productions, for its philosophical style admirably suits the subject.

As a barrister, his one great performance was his defence of Peltier, in 1803, who was prosecuted at the instigation of the first Napoleon, for a libel. His parliamentary speeches were equally studied; the finest being one he delivered on the escape of Bonaparte from Elba. His disposition, however, loved ease too much to lead to his attainment of any high distinction, either as a statesman or as a philosopher. And of this he appears to have been aware; for in a letter addressed to his friend the Rev. Robert Hall, he says—"My nature would have been better consulted if I had been placed in a quieter station, where speculations might have been my business, and visions of the fair and good my chief recreation."

Sir James Mackintosh was chosen Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow in 1822, and was re-elected in the following year. He contributed largely to the *Edinburgh Review*, and for the "Encyclopædia Britannica" wrote the dissertation on the history of ethical science. During the greater part of his life, he held an eminently

honourable place in the literary society of the metropolis.

By his first wife Sir James Mackintosh left a family of three daughters. By his second, whom he married in 1798, two daughters and a son.

The following studied criticism on the now forgotten "Vindiciæ Gallicæ," is from the pen of his friend, the once celebrated Dr. Samuel Parr, who shared in the sentiments expressed in that work. Coming from a clergyman, it is curious for its mild reference to the notorious Tom Paine. But Dr. Parr, as is well known, carried eccentricity of judgment to its wildest limit.

"In Mackintosh I see the sternness of a republican without his acrimony, and the ardour of a reformer without his impetuosity. His taste in morals, like that of Mr. Burke, is equally pure and delicate with his taste in literature. His mind is so comprehensive that generalities cease to be barren; and so vigorous that detail itself becomes interesting. He introduces every question with perspicuity, states it with precision, and pursues it with easy unaffected method. Sometimes, perhaps, he may amuse his readers with excursions into paradox, but he never bewilders them by flights into romance. His philosophy is far more just and far more amiable than *the philosophy of Paine*, and his eloquence is only not equal to the eloquence of Burke. He is argumentative without sophistry, fervid without fury, profound

without obscurity, and sublime without extravagance."

Although it is impossible entirely to agree with this extravagant opinion, it may with truth be said of Sir James Mackintosh, that he was one of the best, as well as one of the wisest, of the political party to which he had attached himself, and that the amiability of his disposition rendered him generally popular. Unlike some of his colleagues who attained a higher position with much less talent, he was not selfish, and took no part in those tamperings with the demagogues of the day that produced such widespread disorder through the length and breadth of the land.

By his numerous personal friends, Mackintosh was regarded with an affectionate interest; the charms of his conversation and the amiability of his manners made a very favourable impression on Wilberforce, who, in the latter part of his life, calls him "a paragon of a companion, quite unequalled." He writes: "He has been sitting chattering to the girls and myself for above an hour, and this extraordinary man spends, they tell me, much of his time in the circulating library here [Clapham] at the end of the Common, and chats with the utmost freedom to all the passengers in the Clapham stage, as he goes [to] and comes from London. It is really to be regretted that he should thus throw away time so valuable. But he is at

everybody's service, and his conversation is always rich and sparkling."[1]

Two days after his funeral (4th June), died another celebrated reformer, who had long been regarded as the Lycurgus of the Radical community, Jeremy Bentham. His career had been a long one, for he was born in 1748, the eldest son of a London attorney, living in Red Lion-street, Houndsditch, who subsequently (1765) purchased the house in Queen-square Place, where the celebrated jurist lived and died. Mr. Jeremy Bentham studied the law, and travelled abroad in 1785, extending his tour to Greece, Turkey, and Russia. His uncle, Sir Samuel Bentham, was a General in the Russian army, and one of his brothers had also entered the same service. It was at Crechoff, in the Emperor's dominions, that Jeremy Bentham wrote his "Letters on the Usury Laws." He returned to England, through Poland and Germany, in 1788. His father died in the year 1792, leaving him sufficiently provided for to be able to follow his own pursuits, which were directed to literature.

Speaking of the Benthamite theories, a contemporary says:—

"They aspire to be universal without regard to place, time, or circumstance. They take in only one element of man—his reason, leaving out his passions, which constitute the chief motive part of his existence, whether as an individual or a member

[1] Life, by his Sons, v. 315.

of society. They provide for the rational, for which there hardly needs provision, leaving out the irrational, that constitute the vast majority, and for whose guidance restraint, law, and government are alone requisite.

"It is only," adds the writer, "by collating the abstractions of philosophy with history that practical government can be perfected. The utility of this is evinced by observing the working of the universal-suffrage principle, which Mr. Bentham in his later years advocated as the necessary guarantee of good government. But in England we appear to have had already too much of universal-suffrage government, and it is to this species of dictatorship over the sway of the intelligent that may be ascribed the chief public calamities."[1]

Jeremy Bentham had neither imagination, taste, nor any sympathy for what was refining in intellect, yet he was honest and earnest. He fancied himself a philanthropist, and when the Emperor Alexander of Russia sent him a diamond ring in acknowledgment of a work addressed to him, he returned the present, with the message that "his object was not to receive rings from Princes, but to do good to the world."

The two Houses of the Legislature now proceeded with the business of the country in a manner totally different from its preceding sittings. In the Lords, the Lord Chancellor introduced various

[1] Wade's "British History," 917.

reforms in the different courts of law, with scarcely any opposition. The Earl of Roden moved for an address to his Majesty, representing the afflicted state of the Protestants of Ireland, that such measures might be adopted as were necessary to uphold the Protestant religion, and protect the liberty and property of all classes of his Majesty's subjects. Though the motion was supported by the Dukes of Cumberland and Wellington, and other influential members of the Opposition, it was opposed by Ministers, who, on a division, had a majority of forty-one. The Irish Reform Bill having passed the Lower House, as well as other Irish and English Bills, these were brought into the Lords, and went through the usual stages with little opposition.

In the Commons the business proceeded in the same manner. Mr. Hume occasionally made himself heard when economy was to be recommended, and Mr. Hunt took less advantage of his opportunities to repeat himself. Towards the close of the session, the Speaker intimating his desire to retire from his important office, the House moved a vote of thanks to him for his services, and an address to the King suggesting some mark of royal favour as their appropriate reward. The result was a liberal pension.

On the 16th of August Parliament was prorogued by his Majesty in person, in a speech lamenting the continued disturbances in Ireland,

and giving the customary assurance respecting the friendliness of foreign Powers, while referring to the position of Holland and Belgium, and the state of Portugal. The House of Commons were thanked for the supplies, and Parliament dismissed, with a hope that the advantages all classes of the King's subjects could now enjoy would be duly appreciated and cherished; that relief from any legitimate cause of complaint would be sought only through legitimate channels; that all irregular and illegal proceedings would be discountenanced and resisted; and that the establishment of internal tranquillity and order would prove that the measures his Majesty had sanctioned would not be fruitless in promoting the security of the State and the contentment and welfare of the people.

On the 9th of August Leopold, King of the Belgians, married the Princess Louise, daughter of the King of the French, who, with his family, were present at Compiègne during the ceremony. A few days before, the only son of Napoleon I., known as the Duke of Reichstadt, had died at the Palace of Schoenbrunn, near Vienna, of consumption, at the age of twenty-one. The event created little interest in Paris: all that was attempted in the way of respect for the memory of the young Prince was a funeral service at the church of St. Mary. The Bonapartists, however, were not so dormant as they appeared.

Marshal Gerard left Paris for Valenciennes on

the 21st of September, to take the command of a French army that was marching to the assistance of King Leopold; and Admiral Ducrest de Villeneuve was appointed to the command of a French squadron, that was directed to join an English squadron in blockading the ports of Holland, as the Dutch King had refused all conditions proposed to him, and General Chassé still maintained possession of the citadel of Antwerp.

Subsequently an embargo was laid on all Dutch vessels in English and French ports. The French and English fleets had previously formed a junction on the 29th of October, and proceeded to the Scheldt; and the French army of 55,000 men, including 12,800 cavalry, took up a position before the citadel of Antwerp, which, after a sharp bombardment, surrendered on the 24th of December. On the 19th of November the King of the French, while he was proceeding to open the Chambers, was fired at by a man with a pistol, who afterwards effected his escape; the ball passed over the King's head. His good fortune also attended his Majesty in the capture of the Duchess de Berri at Nantes, who had for some time contrived to disturb his reign by her adventures in the western provinces of the kingdom, and intrigues on behalf of her son.

A furious contest raged in Portugal during the autumn between Don Pedro and Don Miguel—a civil war under its worst aspect, to support rival pretensions to the throne. Although there was

little difference between the brothers in respect to moral fitness for rule, a certain portion of the people of England took an extraordinary interest in the success of Don Pedro, simply because he professed to enter upon the conflict in the character of a reformer.

During the autumn of the present year her Royal Highness the Duchess of Kent, with her Royal Highness the Princess Victoria, enjoyed a very interesting tour through some of the principal counties of England and Wales. They were everywhere received with the warmest demonstrations of welcome and respect. Having seen the beauties of North Wales, they reached the ancient city of Chester on the 17th of October, and on entering the cathedral the Bishop addressed the royal travellers in appropriate terms, to which the Duchess replied:—

"I cannot better allude to your good feeling towards the Princess than by joining fervently in the wish that she may set an example in her conduct of that piety towards God and charity towards man which is the only sure foundation either of individual happiness or national prosperity."[1]

Their Royal Highnesses subsequently proceeded to Eaton Hall, after which they went to Chatsworth; and in the following week visited Hardwicke Hall, Chesterfield, and Matlock; then to the Earl of Lichfield's (Shugborough); and afterwards

[1] "Annual Register."

partook of the hospitality of the Earl of Shrewsbury at Alton Towers.

On the 26th they made an inspection of the cathedral at Lichfield, and while in the town addresses were presented to them by the clergy and municipality, which were graciously received. Their Royal Highnesses arrived at a seat of the Earl of Liverpool near Shrewsbury, where they were sure of a most welcome reception, Lady Catherine Jenkinson being one of the ladies in waiting on the Duchess, and then in attendance.

Her Royal Highness presented 100*l.* to the Infirmary at Shrewsbury, after which, with the Princess, the Duchess honoured in succession Walcot Park, a residence of the Earl of Powis, and Oakeley Park, that of the Hon. R. H. Clive, M.P. Then they proceeded, on the 5th of November, to Howell Grange, the seat of the Earl of Plymouth, and arriving at Oxford on the evening of the 7th, paid a visit to Wytham, the mansion of the Earl of Abingdon.

The following day, with an escort of yeomanry, the royal visitors entered the University, where they were received with extraordinary respect and honour. Having entered the theatre, which was filled with the dignitaries of the several colleges, the professors, tutors, and students, the Vice-Chancellor read a suitable address, to which the Duchess of Kent gave the following answer:—

"We close a most interesting journey by a visit

to this University, that the Princess may see, as far as her years will allow, all that is interesting in it. The history of our country has taught her to know its importance by the many distinguished persons who, by their character and talents, have been raised to eminence from the education they have received in it. Your loyalty to the King, and recollection of the favour you have enjoyed under the paternal sway of his house, could not fail, I was sure, to lead you to receive his niece with all the disposition you evince to make this visit agreeable and instructive to her. It is my object to insure, by all means in my power, her being so educated as to meet the just expectation of all classes in this great and free country."[1]

Having beheld everything worthy of observation within this classical city, their Royal Highnesses returned to Kensington Palace on the 9th of November, highly gratified with their tour.

Parliament having been dissolved by proclamation on the 3rd of December, a general election had taken place, which, though shortly after the last, made material alterations in the state of the representation. It was, in point of fact, the birth of the reformed Parliament, and no effort was wanting to realize the expectations of the framers of the Government measure. The result was a return in which—divided into the three distinct parties now in the House of Commons—the Whigs had a ma-

[1] "Annual Register."

jority over the Conservatives, and the Conservatives were much superior in numbers to the Radicals and Irish repealers; the force of the latter, however, had considerably augmented, though Mr. Hunt was no longer returned for Preston. In other respects the returns showed a fair proportion of aristocratic names; though an unusually large number of members entered Parliament for the first time.

The following table exhibits the constitution of the House before and after Reform:—

	1830.	1832.
English County Members . .	82	143
„ Cities and Boroughs . .	403	324
„ Universities . . .	4	4
Welsh County Members . .	12	15
„ Cities and Boroughs . .	12	14
Scotch County Members . .	30	30
„ Cities and Boroughs . ..	15	23
Irish County Members . . .	64	64
„ Cities and Boroughs . .	35	39
„ University . . .	1	2

The Conservatives were considered to amount to 149, against 509 Reformers of all descriptions.

Death also had deprived society of some distinguished members of the Conservative party. Among them was the Right Hon. Charles Abbott, Baron Tenterden, Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, and Deputy Speaker of the House of Lords. He was educated at a school in Canterbury, where he was born, and thence went to Oxford, where he

obtained a fellowship. He subsequently studied for the bar, obtained the degree of serjeant-at-law, and became a Judge of the Common Pleas early in 1816. Mr. Abbott was knighted on the 21st of May, and promoted to the Court of King's Bench, of which he was made Chief Justice in 1818. He was ennobled by the title of Baron Tenterden of Hendon, April 25th, 1827.

"Lord Tenterden was not merely a lawyer," it is stated by a competent authority, "he was one of the best classical and mathematical scholars of the age, and up to the last days of his existence was constantly occupied in mastering every kind of knowledge, both popular and scientific. His unequalled diligence, his vast learning, perfect good temper, and unspotted integrity, universally acknowledged, these constitute the highest praise that can be offered to a Judge; and Lord Tenterden's blameless and unblamed private life, and his habitual piety, go far towards making the nearest approach to a perfect character, of which our nature is capable."[1]

He died at his house in Russell-square on the 4th of November, aged seventy-eight.

A celebrated member of the same profession, though to that he owed no part of his fame, Sir Walter Scott, Bart., died at this time. His brilliant career must be as familiar to the reader as his numerous productions. Few men of

[1] *Gentleman's Magazine* for December, 1832.

genius ever in their lifetime acquired so extensive a reputation, and very few indeed ever maintained so long a hold of popular favour.

He was a warm politician and a stanch Conservative. In March, 1831, he attended a public meeting at Jedburgh to express the opinion of the county on the Reform Bill. He listened to some of the speeches spoken in favour of the measure with evident uneasiness, and at last rose and addressed the meeting, evidently under feelings of deep excitement. He said he had come there at great personal inconvenience, as he had been long suffering from serious illness. "But, gentlemen," said he, clenching his fist with an expressive downward movement, "had I known that I should have shed my blood on these boards, I should have spent my last breath in opposing this measure."

He gradually sank, and died the following year on the 21st of September at Abbotsford, at the age of sixty-one. Not quite eight-and-twenty years have passed since his decease, and every member of his family has followed him to the tomb.

The result of the elections had a disheartening effect on some of the Conservative party; those who looked no deeper than the surface, it was calculated to discourage completely; but there were others who not only looked deeper, but took a prospective survey, and were not without consolation. They knew that all violent flows of public opinion have their ebb, for which they were content to wait;

and being aware of the fallacy of the impressions that had led the popular mind so far, felt satisfied that the time must come when truth would prevail.

The only real cause for apprehension lay in a well-founded distrust of the intentions of the Government. In the first consciousness of their strength, they were likely to commence a career of change which might be dangerous to the country; it was hoped, however, that the prudent members of the Cabinet would be able to control the more adventurous, and so far delay or check their inclinations to keep in advance with the movement, as to afford time for popular re-consideration, and the certain result—popular reaction.

CHAPTER II.

[1833.]

ELECTION OF SPEAKER—OPENING OF PARLIAMENT—THE KING'S SPEECH —ITS EFFECT UPON MR. O'CONNELL AND THE REPEALERS—PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS—THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON'S RESERVE—PITIABLE STATE OF THE IRISH CLERGY—CHANGES IN THE GOVERNMENT—COMPLIMENT TO THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON—FIRST SIGN OF REACTION—REDUCTION OF THE MALT DUTY—MAJORITY AGAINST MINISTERS—THEY LOSE GROUND IN POPULAR FAVOUR—ESTIMATE OF LOUIS PHILIPPE—RADICAL MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND—DUKE OF WELLINGTON'S MOTION RESPECTING THE CIVIL WAR IN PORTUGAL —MAJORITY AGAINST MINISTERS IN BOTH HOUSES—PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT—TESTIMONIALS TO REFORMERS.

CHAPTER II.

The proceedings of the first session of the reformed Parliament did not commence till the 29th of January, when the first contest that ensued was for the election of a Speaker. Lord Morpeth and Sir Francis Burdett having proposed Mr. Manners Sutton, Mr. Hume and Mr. O'Connell brought forward Mr. Littleton. The former desired the re-election of their Speaker partly on the grounds of economy—as it would save the retiring pension to which he was entitled—and partly because of his great experience and ability in his important office; but the latter strongly objected to Mr. Manners Sutton as an anti-reformer; nevertheless, after a spirited debate of three hours, that gentleman was re-elected by a large majority.

The King opened Parliament in person on the 5th of February with an unusually long speech, that, after referring to the state of affairs in Portugal and Belgium, dwelt on that of England —expressed many intimations of coming changes that would affect such important interests as the Bank of England, the East India Company, and the Established Church; and a commutation of

tithes was recommended for Ireland. An anxious attention to all *useful* economy was then professed; and then the recent disturbances in Ireland mentioned in unqualified terms as having greatly increased. It was stated that—

"A spirit of insubordination and violence had risen to the most fearful height, rendering life and property insecure, defying the authority of the law, and threatening the most fatal consequences if not promptly and effectually repressed." The royal speech added—

"I feel confident that to your loyalty and patriotism I shall not resort in vain for assistance in these afflicting circumstances, and that you will be ready to adopt such measures of salutary precaution, and to trust to me such additional powers, as may be found necessary for controlling and punishing the disturbers of the public peace, and for preserving and strengthening the legislative union between the two countries, which, with your support, and under the blessing of Divine Providence, I am determined to maintain by all the means in my power, as indissolubly connected with the peace, security, and welfare of my dominions."

It was rather late in the day to make an acknowledgment of a state of things that had unavailingly been brought under the attention of the Government again and again; and after that Government had permitted a free course to the agitation in Ireland, that had sent Mr. O'Connell into the re-

formed Parliament with a long retinue of supporters; but the Ministers fancied that they were now in a position to set the Repealers and ultra-Radicals, who were sure to act with them, at defiance, with the co-operation of the Conservatives in the House, whose patriotism would direct them to support any measures that might be brought forward which were unquestionably for the good of the country. The coming events that cast their shadows before in the King's speech, declared to all the members of the reformed Parliament what was expected from them.

Mr. O'Connell, in the debate on the address, denounced the speech from the throne as "a brutal and bloody address," and a declaration of war against Ireland, and proposed as an amendment the appointment of a Committee of the whole House to consider his Majesty's speech. A spirited debate followed, which was continued for four nights, Ministers declaring their determination to resist repeal —the Conservatives encouraging them to persevere —and the Irish members of the O'Connell party rivalling each other in angry declamation.[1] At the division there were 40 for Mr. O'Connell's amendment, and 428 against it. Another amendment, proposed by Mr. Tennyson, for a searching inquiry into the state of Ireland, produced a division of 60 against 393.

On the 11th of February, on the report on the

[1] "Hansard."

address being brought up, the debate was revived. On its being read a second time, Mr. Cobbett, who was now in Parliament, representing the extreme English Radicals, proposed an entirely new address, and attacked the Whigs; but on a division he was only supported by 23 against 323; and Mr. T. Attwood, a manufacturer, proposed two other amendments, which were negatived more summarily. The original address was then put and agreed to.

On the following day, Lord Althorp introduced the Government measure relating to the Church of Ireland, with which Mr. O'Connell expressed himself satisfied; and though grave objections were made by Sir Robert Peel and Sir R. Inglis to its sweeping changes, the motion was agreed to without a division.

In the House of Lords on the 15th of February, Earl Grey brought forward his measure for suppressing the outrages in Ireland. It was supported by the Duke of Wellington, Lord Eldon, and other Conservative statesmen, and read a first time. It was read a second time on the 18th. In the House of Commons, Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Cobbett, and the Irish and English Radicals, used every means in their power to obstruct the new coercive laws that Ministers were bringing forward, but with little effect; for all the clauses in the Bill for the Suppression of Disturbances in Ireland were passed on the 22nd of March.

The Duke of Wellington, apparently seeing that no advantage was to be gained by any interference, kept perfectly quiet; but this inactivity did not satisfy some of his party.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Wynyard Park, March 25, 1833.

My dear Duke,

I am very grateful for your able and interesting letter, and am deriving a melancholy consolation from seeing there is at least a person of your talents and experience that takes the same view of things I do.

I own I deplore the D. of W.'s total secession.

It is only making the H. of Lords—as the Radicals pronounce it—of *no use* to the country. I learn his Grace will not oppose to division by proxies either the Irish Grand Jury Bill, the *Irish Church*, or Corporation Bills. The two latter, in my mind, strike at the root of all *property* in my unfortunate country. Can this really be the determination? I see no hope of any division in our House on the Coercion Bill, however diluted it re-appears.

In considering your letter the following remarks more immediately occur. It would seem to me as if, in your views, there was a more immediate working of the Peel party; and I do not very well comprehend to *what number* we are to look to form an immediate party. Are we to turn Whigs? or are the remnants to become Conservatives? This is the main question. Is Peel's star of power or Stanley's to have the ascendant? How can you and I amalgamate with Jemmy Graham, Lansdowne, and Co. (in a few short days)? What power could control

Brougham? Could *he* and *Peel* ever act in concert? One or other must dictate. Which is that to be? These are points of no small difficulty. Pray consider them deeply in looking to any propositions such as you contemplate. My own notion is, upon maturer thought, that at least (*as yet*, on the first break up) the Whigs who go out (supposing them to do so) *could* not join PEEL coming in as Premier.

I will write again in a few days. I shall certainly be in town after Easter. As to going to Paris, I would most willingly give it up, if attendance is required. But when I am told nothing is to be opposed in our House, why should I remain?

Ever yours most sincerely,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

The Duke, however, had by no means seceded. His Grace was at his post, where he maintained the most careful observation of what was going forward. He spoke in the House of Lords on several occasions, but always with moderation, avoiding every appearance of interference. Nor did he choose to be hurried into any demonstrations against the Government. The Duke of Buckingham appears to have written to him for some suggestions; but none would he make. He preferred, for the present at least, to keep his own course and his own counsel.

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Strathfieldsaye, March 29, 1833.

My dear Duke,

I have received only this morning your note of the 27th inst.

I have not seen either of the Bills to which you refer; and I could not decide positively upon the course which I should recommend to be taken in respect to either till I should see them, and converse with others.

I propose to return to London to-morrow, and to stay there as short a time as possible. But I conclude that I must stay for the discussion on the amendments of the Irish Coercion Bill.

Believe me,

Ever yours most sincerely,

Wellington.

His Grace the Duke of Buckingham, &c., K.G.

The Duke would not give an opinion or throw out a suggestion; he must be well informed on every point before he would make up his mind on any; and must "converse with others"—consult Sir Robert Peel before he decides. On receiving a subsequent letter from the same correspondent, he seems desirous of maintaining more strictly the same reserve.

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

London, March 31, 1833.

My dear Duke,

I am very much obliged to you for your note, in which you inform me that you think it right to communicate to me your intention in relation to the proceedings of the House of Lords on the Coercion Bill to-morrow.

Believe me,

Ever yours most sincerely,

Wellington.

H. G. the Duke of Buckingham, &c., K.G.

There was evidently no drawing out the Duke of Wellington; when he was indisposed to be communicative, not a word was to be extracted from him; and if the attempt to get him to speak out was repeated, his thoughts were in a moment hermetically sealed. Nevertheless, mutual danger demanded mutual confidence, and the weakness of the Government in depriving their Coercion Bill of its wholesome rigour, after so much threatening in the speech from the Throne, should, it is evident, have been met with combined remonstrance, by the Conservative leaders. The Duke, however, if he thought so, did not care to let it be known; and if he did not think so, was equally determined to keep his opinion to himself.

Another politician took a different view of what should be the conduct of a political leader.

H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CUMBERLAND TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

St. James's, Sunday, March 21, 1833.

MY DEAR DUKE,

Not having been able as yet to get the printed Bill as amended, I am totally unacquainted, nor can I from the debates (which I have read with attention), make out *all* the changes that are in the Bill; but I really believe that it is so transmogrified, that it is, in fact, a perfect *new* one; however, I shall certainly be at the House and pay every due attention to your motion; but I think we have a right to complain of the *thing* imposed on us.

Yours very truly,

ERNEST.

In consequence of the general resistance to the payment of tithes in Ireland, the poorer members of the Established Church in that country were reduced to the greatest privations. The parish clergy, instead of being the liberal friends of the poor, were so totally deprived of the means of existence, that they were themselves entirely pauperized, and lived day by day in the greatest misery. Their state at last became so pitiable, that a subscription was entered into in England and Ireland for their relief.

The Archbishop of Armagh set the example in Ireland, by a donation of 500*l.*; 400*l.* was sent by the Bishop of Clogher; 300*l.* came from the Bishops of Derry and Limerick; 200*l.* from those

of Ferns and Raphoe; and the Irish prelates generally, and some of the nobility, were also liberal in their contributions. In England, the subscription was headed by the King with 200*l.*, and the Queen with 100*l.*; the same sum was given by the Duke of Cumberland and the Duchess of Kent; 200*l.* was subscribed for this truly benevolent object by the Duke of Northumberland; and 100*l.* by the Dukes of Wellington and Devonshire, Lords Talbot, Clifden, Kenyon, Arden, and Bexley, and others.

In the month of March some alterations were made in the Administration. On the 15th Lord Durham was created Viscount Lambton and Earl of Durham, and resigned his post of Lord Privy Seal, which was bestowed upon Viscount Goderich, who a few days later was created Earl of Ripon. On the 28th Sir John Cam Hobhouse became Chief Secretary for Ireland, the Right Hon. E. G. Stanley Secretary for the Colonies, and Right Hon. Edward Ellice Secretary at War. The Government were evidently losing ground with the ultra-Liberals in consequence of their measures to put down sedition; and now an extensive agitation was got up for a repeal of the assessed taxes, and against the laws respecting factory labour, then under the consideration of the House of Commons.

On the 18th of April a Committee to inquire into the state and management of the retail beer-houses throughout the country was moved for and

obtained. The same day the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought in a Bill for the commutation of tithes, which was read a first time; and Mr. Hume brought forward three resolutions on sinecure offices, which met with the usual fate of that gentleman's parliamentary propositions.

Ireland continued to be so disturbed that the provisions of the late Act were obliged to be applied to some of the counties. The Lord-Lieutenant, on the 10th of April, by proclamation, prohibited and suppressed the association styled the Irish Volunteers, and on the 17th the National Trades Political Union.

The recent proceedings of the Duke of Wellington against the Government had been so much approved of in the University of Oxford, that a general subscription was entered into among the resident members for the purpose of procuring a marble bust of his Grace. When sufficient funds had been collected, an application was made to the Duke through Lord Sidmouth, which elicited the following reply:—

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO LORD SIDMOUTH.

London, April 2, 1833.

My dear Lord Sidmouth,

Till I received your note of the 30th, I had not an idea that any body of his Majesty's subjects had thought proper to approve of the course which I followed upon the occasion referred to: I felt that my duty to the

King required that I should make a great sacrifice of opinion to serve him, and to save his Majesty and the country from what I considered a great evil. Others were not of the same opinion. I failed in performing the service which I intended to perform; and I had imagined that I had satisfied nobody but myself, and those of my friends who were aware of my motives, and who knew what I was doing, and the course which I intended to follow.

It is very gratifying to me to learn that Mr. Keble and other gentlemen of the University observed and approved of my conduct, and that they are desirous of testifying their sense of it in the manner stated in the letter addressed to your lordship.

They may rely upon it that I will attend Mr. Chantrey or anybody else they please, with the greatest satisfaction. I will do so, not only because I am personally gratified by their approbation, but I am grateful to them, as a public man and a faithful subject of the King, for the encouragement which they give to others to devote themselves to the King's service by their applause of the course which I followed on that occasion.

Ever, my dear Lord,
Yours most sincerely,
WELLINGTON.

The Viscount Sidmouth,
Richmond Park.

This communication was admirably adapted to raise the spirits of the Conservatives. They saw in it something that was not upon the surface, and in consequence felt more secure in the pre-

sent and more confident in the future. The popularity of the Duke in that ancient seat of learning and loyalty very much increased, and from thence a reaction of opinion began to manifest itself throughout the more intelligent and respectable portion of the community, of which his Grace shortly afterwards reaped the advantage. He, with his characteristic sagacity, was content to wait his time.

An important debate came on in the House of Commons on the 22nd of April, when Mr. M. Attwood moved for a Committee to inquire into the distresses of the country, particularly into the effects of the monetary system as established by the measure of 1819. Lord Althorp opposed, stating that the question was neither more nor less than whether they were prepared to stand by a system in obedience to which all the contracts of the country had for many years been made. Messrs. Grote and Cobbett supported the motion, but the sense of the House was so strongly against it that, after a discussion that lasted two nights, the division was 49 against 304.

Mr. Grote, on the 25th, brought forward the ballot, which motion Lord Althorp and Sir Robert Peel opposed. The division was 106 against 211. On the 26th, on the question of supply, it was moved by a Conservative member that in any reduction of taxation the interests of the agriculturist should be properly considered. In a thin House

this was negatived by 118 to 96. Sir W. Ingilby then proposed a reduction of the malt duty, which Lord Althorp opposed, and on a division 162 members voted for it, and 152 against, showing a majority against Ministers of 10.

This result embarrassed the Government extremely, and on the 30th Sir John Key moved for a repeal of the house and window taxes, which embarrassed them still more; but the Conservatives came to their relief, and the motion was negatived by a division of 355 against 157; and on Sir W. Ingilby moving for leave to bring in a Bill founded on his resolution affirmed by the House, it was similarly disposed of by a division of 238 against 76.

The Ministry had therefore been saved, but they were fast sinking in popular estimation; indeed, rumours were afloat of their going out of office. "Report says," it is stated by a shrewd observer, "*some* of the Ministers, when they were beaten in a vote a few nights ago, offered their resignations, and that their master said, 'No; if any go, all shall go.' All remained." He adds, "There is a report, believed by some (I know not what to make of it), that there are movements towards forming a Coalition Ministry of Whigs and Tories. If it be so, if we are to have the old hated junction, such as Lord North and Fox heretofore made, and which was followed by public detestation, I shall endeavour to enjoy the blessings of a perfectly retired life."[1]

[1] Lord Eldon. Twiss's "Life," ii. 311.

The Whigs were drawing upon themselves the change of the tide which one of the wisest of their leaders had foreseen. During one of the debates on the Reform question, Lord Sidmouth held a friendly colloquy with Earl Grey, who, he always thought, had been carried far beyond the views and intentions he originally entertained on the introduction of this measure. "I hope," Lord Sidmouth said, "God will forgive you on account of this Bill —I don't think *I* can." To this Lord Grey replied, "Mark my words, *within two years* you will find that we have become unpopular for having brought forward the most aristocratic measure that was ever proposed in Parliament."[1]

The Duke of Buckingham, in consequence of indisposition, had been prevented from taking any active share in politics; and other influential leaders of the same party had withdrawn from anything like real opposition. Lord Eldon was becoming too infirm for much parliamentary attendance, though he regarded the numerous and sweeping changes of the Lord Chancellor's measures of judicial reform with no favourable eye. Lord Sidmouth led a very retired life. The Marquis of Londonderry had left England for a foreign tour with some of the members of his family. He was now in Paris, enjoying, as a matter of course, the best society of that eminently social capital, where he met several old political friends. Among others,

[1] Dean Pellew, "Life of Lord Sidmouth," iii. 439.

Count Pozzo di Borgo, who had figured prominently in the diplomacy of the last twenty years, and with him he appears to have had some conversation on the existing state of affairs.

In the following letter, he enters into a long review of events at home and abroad, apparently as little pleased with the conduct of the Opposition, as with that of the English Government. What he states respecting Talleyrand's detestation of England, and Russian influence, is worthy of observation. The former was and always had been hostile, whether Republican, Imperialist, or Bourbon; the latter was pursuing her own policy, which cared little for English or for any but Russian interests.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Paris, May 5, 1833.

My dear Duke,

I trust this will find you entirely recovered from your late illness. Believe me, no friend wishes it more sincerely than I do. It appears to me from late events in England, that although circumstances, and their own blunders, are pulling down our wretched Cabinet every day, still Peel and Co. are determined to prop them up, and carry them on their backs (as you said). This late large majority will make them stronger than before their defeat, and my opinion is, our party are playing that game that will indisputably keep the Ministers in for this session.

It would seem as if Peel had no courage to take office but with the consent of the reforming chiefs, and when they find their odium beyond endurance, from the tricks they have practised, they will slide out of office, and then Peel thinks to slide in, having paralysed their opposition; and then, with them and his own party, he will defy the Radicals. It needs to be seen if Sir Robert does not calculate without his host, and if Grey and Co.'s fondness for office (when they have Peel and Co. in their second line *quiescent*, if not supporting) will not keep them there for longer than anything can be counted upon in this world of woe and of change.

I own I am out of all patience at what is going on, and it is really from *policy* that I have absented myself; as had I attended the Lords, my nature is too open not to have expressed my opinions *tout bien que mal.*

In our foreign affairs, from what I learn here, the very intimate alliance professed between France and England, to the repudiation of all our former confidential continental alliances, is as *hollow* at bottom as can be well imagined. The two countries are more jealous, more envious, and detest each other more than at any former period. Palmerston and Talleyrand are afraid, day after day, of either having an advantage. Both are suspicious, and under the mask of friendship, there is the same deadly detestation as has ever marked the relations of the two countries. England, by her policy, is laughed at by the three Powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, who think this triple alliance strong enough to hold England and France in derision; and the incontestable proof of this is, that while France and England have chosen, against all treaties, to intervene and establish a new order of things in Belgium, Russia (with the sanction of

Austria and Prussia) advances on Constantinople, and will wield that empire hereafter as her interests direct. England has not had a voice in the Mediterranean, and Roussin's negotiations, &c., are quite ridiculed. The French have three ships, and we have two (I believe) in those seas; and were we to attempt to pass the Dardanelles, and avert the occupation by the Russians of Constantinople, Pozzo told me yesterday, he has orders immediately to ask for his passport, and Russia would declare war against France.

In respect to the Government here, I can tell you little, as much is enveloped in mystery, in plotting, and deep cabals.

Apparently, the Ministry is stronger from the new session and from the differences amongst the parties. But *le juste milieu* system cannot go on long here, and its adoption in England will *not do*. Louis Philippe is a shrewd, deep, designing character. He has played his cards for the moment well, and has steered his bark dexterously, by cajoling, duping, and setting up one set or section of a party against another. But he is well known now, and universally disliked; and I should not be surprised if his fate ended in assassination by the violence of the republican party. In the meantime, I think commerce seems flourishing. Great capital is kept in the country, as no one knows where or how to place it. Paris increases in shops, in buildings, and in beauty, and it is so full of Americans, Russians, Poles, &c., it is almost impossible to get an apartment. The weather is delicious, and we enjoy ourselves excessively.

Let me have a line, my dear Duke, saying how you are; direct to Holdernesse House, or L'Hôtel de l'Europe, Rue Rivoli. Chabot is here as trim as

usual. No other difference. Our best regards to the D. of C.

Ever yours, very truly and sincerely,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

Lord Londonderry's view of foreign affairs, if hasty, was remarkably faithful, particularly as regards the policy of Russia and France. His estimate, too, of the character of the King of the Barricades was as shrewd as his anticipation of attempts at assassination was true. France had shown signs of repentance for her precipitation, and a disposition to quarrel with her late idol; but there was now an interval of calm, and the King endeavoured to turn it to his advantage.

Public opinion in England began to manifest itself in the elections by popular constituencies. In Westminster, Sir John Hobhouse, the Ministerial candidate, was headed at the poll by Colonel Evans, by a majority of 250. A conflict with the police occurred at a meeting held in Coldbath Fields three days later (May 13th), to adopt measures for choosing "a National Convention," when one of the constables was mortally wounded with a dagger; but the state of feeling in the public mind was further declared at the Coroner's inquest, by a verdict of *Justifiable Homicide*. About six months before, a youth of nineteen was killed near Leeds, for having given offence to the Trades Unions, and the assassins escaped.

On the 16th of May, Mr. Cobbett, in the House of Commons, moved a resolution condemning Peel's Currency Bill of 1819, and for an address to the King to dismiss Sir Robert from the Privy Council. Sir Robert Peel spoke with his usual ability in defence of his measure, and the result was a division, in which only four voted for the motion. Lord Althorp then moved that the proceedings on the resolution be expunged from the minutes, which was carried by a very large majority.[1] Two days later, a large meeting assembled on New Hall Hill, near Birmingham, to petition the King to dismiss his Ministers, when Messrs O'Connell and Attwood addressed the assemblage in favour of the petition.

The proceedings at Court at this period did not exhibit any particular apprehensions from the violence of the ultra-Radicals; indeed, there seemed to be a disposition encouraged to let the politicians of all parties settle their differences in the best way they could; and very little sympathy was shown for the increasing unpopularity of the Government. On the 27th, the King's birthday was celebrated by a drawing-room and a dinner of unusual magnificence. On the following day, there was a brilliantly attended levee, and a grand dinner to the Jockey Club. In the same week, Prince George of Cumberland's birthday was celebrated at the palatial residence at Kew, and a juvenile ball was given at St. James's in

[1] "Hansard."

honour of the birthday of the Princess Victoria; a dinner was also given by the King to the Nulli Secundus Club.

The Houses of Parliament continued to be occupied with questions of deep interest, such as the corn laws, slavery in the West Indies, the Bank charter, and Jewish civil disabilities; but the most important debate took place in the House of Lords on the 1st of June, when the Duke of Wellington brought forward a motion on the affairs of Portugal. The Government had encouraged the recruiting in this country of a large military force to go to the assistance of Don Pedro, who still continued at war with his brother, Don Miguel, for the possession of Portugal; and his Grace having shown that such a proceeding was contrary to the law of nations, moved—

"That an humble address be presented to his Majesty, to entreat him that he would be graciously pleased to give such directions as were necessary to enforce the observance by his subjects of his Majesty's declared neutrality in the contest now going on in Portugal."

Lords Aberdeen, Eldon, and Wynford clearly proved that the fitting out of warlike expeditions in the ports of the kingdom, and the enlistment of soldiers in the country, were breaches of the law of neutrality, as expounded by the first law authorities; nevertheless, Earl Grey, the Marquis of Lansdowne, and the Lord Chancellor opposed the

motion. On the division, there was a majority against Ministers of twelve.

On the 6th, the Marquis Wellesley presented to the House his Majesty's answer to the address, to which the Government gave a somewhat petulant and undignified character. On the same day, in the Commons, an address was proposed by Colonel Davies on the same subject, declaring the approval of the House of the proceedings of Government, which was carried by a large majority, of which his Majesty a few days later was made to express his satisfaction.

The House then went into Committee on the Colonial Slavery Bill; many amendments were moved, but none carried, and the resolutions passed. Mr. C. Grant, on the 13th, brought forward the question of the East India Company's charter; and the Solicitor moved for and obtained leave to bring in a Bill to abolish imprisonment for debt. The Factories Regulations Bill and the Irish Tithe Act were also much discussed.

The King of the French seemed to be enjoying a respite from the troubles his subjects had afforded him. Commotions in Paris had ceased; the disturbances in the western provinces of the kingdom were also at an end. The capture of the Duchess de Berri had not only put an end to the intrigues in that direction, but it had drawn upon them a good deal of ridicule; for that adventurous lady, while intent upon advancing the repu-

tation of her son, had apparently lost sight of her own, and during her confinement it was announced that she had given birth to a child. The Duchess now stated that she was married. The nation generally became so indifferent to her that the Government wisely opened her prison doors, and she was sent in a frigate to Palermo. The King also made a tour in the provinces with tolerably favourable results; and, that nothing might be wanting for his security, projected a prodigious system of fortification for his capital, which, he made the people believe, was to secure it from foreign invasion.

Inflammatory and seditious libels continuing to appear, on the 17th of June, on a question being put in the House of Lords to Earl Grey respecting political unions, Lord Eldon pressed upon the Government the duty of employing the law to put down these combinations, and to suppress the publications that had been circulated during the last two years. But nothing came of it: Ministers being afraid of exciting the masses against them by pursuing the proper course.

The Radicals, however, knew their power, and on the 16th of July Mr. Ruthven moved, "that the reduction of taxation, and the diminution of the public burdens by every attention to economy, are objects of paramount importance; and that, in justice to the people who pay taxes, all sinecure places should be abolished throughout the British Empire."

Lord Althorp objected to the motion on the ground that grants had been made for services, and that they could not now be revoked. Sir Robert Peel also objected to it, because he thought the truth it contained too obvious to need enforcement, and because he disliked to see individual members bringing forward, without the slightest necessity, abstract propositions, about which there was no dispute, and that tended to no practical result. On the division there was a majority against Ministers of nine.

The following day, Earl Grey moved the second reading of the Irish Church Reform Bill, which produced a very animated debate. Earl Roden opposed it, and moved that the Bill be read that day six months, and was supported by Lord Winchelsea and the Marquis of Londonderry, Lord Eldon, and several of the prelates. The Duke of Wellington, while gravely censuring the conduct of Ministers towards Ireland, said it was impossible that the Church could continue to exist there without such a Bill. His Grace, however, left the House without voting. After a three days' debate, the Ministers obtained a majority of fifty-nine. In the Commons, the Government were in a minority of forty-five, an amendment in Committee on the Factories Bill having been carried against them. In the Lords, on the 26th, they were in a minority of two in a division on an amendment

proposed when the Irish Church Reform Bill was in Committee.

A Bill to shorten the duration of Parliaments, brought forward by Mr. Tennyson on the 23rd of July, was lost on a division of 213 to 164. On the order of the day being moved on the 30th for the third reading of the Church Temporalities Bill, it was moved that it be read that day six months. The Duke of Wellington again would not oppose, and the Bill passed by a division of 135 to 81. On the 1st of August there was another lively debate on the second reading of the Bill to remove the civil disabilities of the Jews, which was opposed by the Dukes of Gloucester and Wellington, the Earl of Winchelsea, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of London; and supported by the Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishop of Chichester, the Duke of Sussex, Lord Bexley, and the Lord Chancellor. The Bill was lost by a majority of 104 to 54.

On the 28th, all the public business having been got through, his Majesty prorogued Parliament in person, with a speech that commenced by complimenting the members on the manner in which they had discharged their duties; then referred to the arrangements that had terminated the hostilities in Belgium; announced that an ambassador had been sent to Donna Maria, now established in Lisbon as Queen of Portugal; mentioned the laws

that had passed for the renewal of the charters of the Bank and of the East India Company; alluded to the settlement of the colonial slavery question; dwelt on the various reforms that had been effected in the courts of law; then, having stated that the disturbances in Ireland had abated, noticed in succession the laws that had been passed during the session with the object of producing beneficial improvements in that country. Thanks were given for the supplies, and a regard for judicious economy expressed. A few encouraging words concluded the document.

So ended the first session of the reformed Parliament. Much had been said and a good deal had been done; nevertheless there could be little doubt that the Government was less popular at the end than at the beginning. In the autumn of last year a penny subscription had produced for Lords Brougham, Althorp, and John Russell gold cups weighing eighty-five ounces, and made to contain five pints. Nothing of the kind was forthcoming in the summer of this year. Great honour, too, had been done reformers in the gross by a picture representing the reformed House of Commons, painted as regardless of expense as of space.

CHAPTER III.

[1833–4.]

THE PRINCESS VICTORIA — AFFAIRS IN FRANCE — INCENDIARISM IN ENGLAND—DEATH OF LORD GRENVILLE—ESTIMATE OF HIS CHARACTER AND POLITICAL SERVICES—CONTRAST BETWEEN 1795 AND 1833—THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON ELECTED CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD—HIS OPINION OF THE GOVERNMENT AND OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—COMMENCEMENT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE REFORMED PARLIAMENT—MR. SHIEL AND LORD ALTHORP IN THE CUSTODY OF SERGEANT-AT-ARMS — MINISTERS IN A MINORITY — COMBINATIONS OF WORKMEN — STRIKES — ILLEGAL OATHS AND MUMMERIES — DESPOTISM OF TRADES UNIONS — THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON EVINCES MORE ACTIVITY.

CHAPTER III.

Her Royal Highness the Princess Victoria was now brought forward at important assemblages of the people. The Princess was residing in the summer of 1833 with the Duchess of Kent at Norris Castle, East Cowes, and attended the ceremonial of opening the new landing-pier at that fast improving and thriving port, Southampton. A steamer having towed the royal yacht from Cowes, a state barge with eight oars containing a deputation representing the mayor, corporation, gentry, and inhabitants of Southampton—one of the town-sergeants standing with the silver oar in the bow—was rowed to the yacht to conduct their Royal Highnesses to the pier.

The Hon. P. B. de Blaquiere announced the object of their visit; and the Duchess, while returning her acknowledgments, replied that it was a great advantage to the Princess to be taught thus early the importance of being attached to works of utility; adding, that it was her anxious desire to impress upon her daughter the value of everything

recommended by its practical utility to all classes of the community. There were at least 25,000 spectators when their Royal Highnesses arrived on the pier, where the staff of the South Hants Militia formed a military guard; and they were conducted to a handsome marquee, in which an excellent collation had been prepared.

An address to their Royal visitors was then presented by the corporation, acknowledging the distinction they had conferred upon the town, and requesting the Duchess to name the pier. Her Royal Highness named it "The Royal Pier," and added her sincere good wishes that it might promote the prosperity of the town. Subsequently there was a regatta in the Southampton Water, and public dinners were given at the Freemasons' Hall and the Castle Inn; which later in the evening were followed by an illumination at the pier-gates and a display of fireworks. The port presented a very animated appearance; and the townspeople were almost as proud of the presence of the Princess as of the completion of their pier.

Their Royal Highnesses were much gratified with their reception, and returned to Cowes, where on the 11th they were present at the consecration by the Bishop of Worcester of a new chapel-of-ease. On the 15th of September, when the young Queen of Portugal was at Portsmouth on her way to her dominions, their Royal Highnesses paid her Majesty a visit. The sanguinary contest that had for some

time been carried on between the brothers Don Miguel and Don Pedro was considered to be so nearly at an end, that Donna Maria had been sent for to take possession of her capital. This result was in a great measure owing to British co-operation both by land and sea; an interference in the quarrel, while we professed neutrality, that was gravely censured by every one capable of forming an unprejudiced opinion.

The extraordinary lull in the disturbed ocean of French politics continued, and Louis Philippe did his best to profit by it. The kingdom appeared to be flourishing generally. Trade was reviving in the manufacturing towns; and the King of the French, to please the Republicans, restored the monograms of Napoleon that had been erased from the palaces at the Restoration; to please the loyal, visited Cherbourg in great state; to please the adventurous, ordered a vast armament at Toulon with the intention of occupying Algiers, which had recently been taken by French troops, and of establishing a French colony on that portion of Africa. While the King of the French was showing great ingenuity in finding employment for his restless subjects, he was the *Paterfamilias* of royalty, displaying the fertility of his resources in procuring establishments for his numerous offspring. We have noticed how speedily he made his neighbour, the King of the Belgians, his son-in-law; and he was now looking carefully through the European

Governments with a view to similar provident domestic arrangements.

In the meantime, the English Government was, with equal industry, employed making the most of their opportunities. They added to the peerage a few more zealous supporters. The Duke of Argyle was made Lord Steward of the Household, and sworn of the Privy Council; the Marquis Wellesley superseded the Marquis of Anglesey as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; but their great scramble was the creation of Commissioners of Inquiry—one into the constitution and state of the municipal corporations of England and Wales created intense excitement among those ancient institutions.

These proceedings were not approved of by the Conservative Opposition, many of whom continued to be desirous of active co-operation against the Government. The reference at the commencement of the following letter is to the present King of Hanover, who was then suffering from a malady which unfortunately proved irremediable:—

H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CUMBERLAND TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

St. James's Palace, September 20, 1833.

DEAR DUKE,

On account of my son's health I have found it necessary, as I could not possibly persuade Baron Graefe, the celebrated oculist of Berlin (who so fortunately succeeded in restoring my sight, which is the greatest blessing that Providence can bestow), to remain here and undertake

his cure, of which he has given me hopes, I have found myself under the painful necessity of carrying him over there to place him under his immediate care; but after having placed him and the D. C. safely there, I mean to return back here for the meeting of Parliament, whenever it is to assemble for business.

You know me too well, my dear Duke, to doubt my love for my country, or my determination to stand and fight to the last for the maintenance of all those sacred rites and laws that still are left to us. I trust and hope, therefore, that my friends *may* not abandon me, but will rally together; and I promise to be back a week or a fortnight previous to the meeting of Parliament, in order to consult and concert with them the best course we ought to take. No man has shown greater determination or has a correcter view of the constitution of this country than yourself; therefore I beseech you, as you *value* all that is most dear to us, *not* to fail to be in town about *ten* days previous to that period.

In the meantime keep up a correspondence with our friends that they may *all* act in unison together; and depend upon it, if we go seriously to work this session, we may do what we ought to have done the last. I feel it a duty I owe to you, my dear Duke, to state honestly and truly to you these my feelings. Be assured that I am *not flying away* or *abandoning* the party, but shall be firmer and more vigilant if possible than ever; indeed nothing but my parental duties would carry me away NOW. This has deranged *all* my plans, as you may easily imagine; but *here* I shall be at your service and that of all my friends.

Believe me, dear Duke,

Yours very faithfully,

ERNEST.

Towards the close of the autumn, incendiarism reappeared in several English counties, with increased violence, particularly in Cambridge, Hampshire, Suffolk, Norfolk, Sussex, Kent, Northamptonshire, and Wiltshire; still a mystery was maintained respecting them, that indicated a directing influence much superior to the intelligence of agricultural labourers. Almost contemporary was the introduction into this country of a sect of French politicians, called St. Simonians; the chief feature of their political creed being a communion of goods and women.

Mischievous publications continuing to circulate sedition, the editor and proprietor of a Radical provincial newspaper was prosecuted in the Court of King's Bench, found guilty, and sentenced to six months' imprisonment, to pay a fine of 50*l*., and to find good securities for three years, for publishing in his paper an article tending to set the lower orders against the higher, to excite the people to acts of incendiarism, and to bring the magistrates of Sussex into contempt.

Resistance to the payment of the assessed taxes increased, and several associations were formed for their total abolition. Individuals in different parishes, who made themselves conspicuous by their opposition to these rates, were served with Exchequer processes that produced a most wholesome effect, notwithstanding that the populace had, in one instance, rescued property seized for arrears of taxes. An effect still more beneficial resulted from

the execution at Cambridge of a noted incendiary, who had contrived to destroy property to the amount of 60,000*l*. He used, after causing a conflagration, to give immediate notice to the nearest fire-office, for which authentic intelligence he had been in the habit of receiving six shillings and sixpence on each occasion.

"When I look at the state of the country," wrote Lord Eldon, in the last month of the year, "and see, or think I see, the owners of property sinking—I fear inevitably sinking—under the rule and domination of democrats, I have no comfort in looking forward."[1] There was consolation, however, to be found in the prospect, if the aged Minister could have seen it.

The session of the two French Chambers was opened on the 23rd of December, by the King in person. He addressed them in a very encouraging speech, in which among other things, he assured them that industry was meeting its reward throughout the country, and that all Frenchmen were fully occupied, and were convinced of the stability of existing institutions and of their sovereign's faithful watch over their interests. His Majesty appears to have been very well received, and—was not shot at.

One of Jeremy Bentham's great political expedients, the vote by ballot, received "a heavy blow and great discouragement" about the same time;

[1] Twiss, "Life."

for the Common Council of the City of London, who had adopted it, finding that it was employed to conceal the most scandalous jobbing and corruption, resolved on its abolition.

During the year several distinguished public characters had passed from us for ever. Among them were Lord Exmouth, one of our ablest naval officers; Lord King, the author of "The Life of John Locke," his lordship's ancestor; Major-General Sir John Malcolm, a military officer of great talent, and author of the "History of Persia," and other works relating to our Indian empire; and William Wilberforce, the great advocate of abolition. The latter was honoured with a public funeral in Westminster Abbey, which was attended by politicians of every party; persons of the highest rank setting aside their differences of opinion, to show their respect to his memory. Among the latter, were their Royal Highnesses the Dukes of Sussex and Gloucester, the Duke of Wellington, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London and Chichester, the Marquises of Londonderry and Westminster; Lords Sidmouth, Bexley, Eldon, Grey, and Ripon, the Lord Chancellor, and the Speaker of the House of Commons.

We had also lost Admiral Sir E. Blackwood, who had been Groom of the Bedchamber to the King; Earl Fitzwilliam, a zealous Whig politician; Agar Ellis, Lord Dover, an accomplished nobleman, the author of several historical works; George

Granville Leveson Gower, first Duke of Sutherland, a munificent patron of art; and Henry George Herbert, second Earl of Carnarvon, a personal friend of Fox, but one of whose last political acts was a strenuous opposition to the Reform Bill.

On the 12th of the following January, died a man as distinguished by rare intellectual gifts as by eminent services—Lord Grenville. The important share he had in the correspondence submitted to the public in the series of works of which these volumes form the conclusion, must have made the reader familiar with his abilities. He had for some time been in a declining state of health, but almost to the last moment of consciousness had regarded the political aspect of the times with deep anxiety. He died in his seventy-fourth year, at Dropmore.

During his political career, Lord Grenville had filled the offices of (1782) private secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (his brother, Lord Temple), and Privy Councillor; and in the same year, succeeded Mr. Burke as Paymaster to the Forces. In an admirable memoir of him, it is said of his parliamentary labours at this period, "He was the able coadjutor of the youthful Minister, William Pitt, his cousin-german, who was only a few years his senior; firm to his post, and in full possession of all his faculties. If he wanted the brilliant eloquence of his relation, he possessed more minuteness of knowledge and accuracy of detail. The routine of office was almost hereditary in him.

He seemed to have imbibed all the ideas and habits of his father, even though he was a child at the death of that persevering statesman."

He had been returned for Buckingham in 1782, but two years later stood for the county, when he was elected after a tremendous contest; and before he had completed his thirtieth year, was chosen Speaker of the House of Commons (Jan. 5th, 1789); a few months afterwards, however, he was obliged to resign this honourable post, having been appointed Secretary of State for the Home Department; and in November of the following year, Mr. William Grenville was raised to the peerage.

In May, 1791, Lord Grenville became Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and was appointed Ranger of St. James's and Hyde Parks; the latter he gave up in the year 1795, when he became Auditor of the Exchequer. "He filled the situation of Foreign Secretary," it has been stated, "during one of the most arduous and gloomy periods of our history, with industry, talent, and skill. It was a function for which his natural and acquired powers were in many respects well suited. He was skilled in the detail of the politics of Europe; he had studied deeply the law of nations; he was acquainted with modern languages; he could endure fatigue, and had not an avocation or a pleasure to interrupt his attention. He loved business as his father did; it was not merely the result of his ambition, but his amusement; the flowers of imagination or the

gaieties of society never seduced him astray. There was nothing to dissipate his ideas, and he brought his mind to bear on the subjects before him with its full force."

It should be borne in mind that this was the period of the French Revolution, towards the prime agents of which, when brought into official communion, Lord Grenville conducted himself with a spirit worthy of his position and of his country. His correspondence with the ambassador from the Directory—M. Chauvelin—is characterized by a manliness and dignity, united with a grave severity, that cannot be too highly admired.

The position he assumed towards his own countrymen, among whom French example was exercising a pernicious influence, was equally remarkable for courage and ability. In the year 1795, when George III. was assaulted by the mob while proceeding to open Parliament, Lord Grenville introduced a Bill into the House of Lords to provide for the protection of the royal person, which, despite of a violent opposition, was carried.

He followed it up with another Bill for the suppression of seditious societies.

It is worth while comparing his conduct as a Minister of George III., with that of the Ministers of William IV., when the Crown was equally insulted. On the 6th of November, when the order of the day was read for taking into consideration the recent proclamation of the King against sedi-

tious meetings and menacing combinations, referring to his Bill against treasonable practices, he said,

"It was notorious that the evil the Bill aimed to correct, had got to such a height, that not only seditious papers were diffused, but meetings were publicly held, at which discourses were delivered of a nature calculated to inflame the passions of the multitude industriously collected to hear them. To that was to be ascribed the outrage that had lately taken place. It was no longer the flimsy pretence of some imaginary grievance, or the slight pretext of a wish for a parliamentary reform, that could be set up as the motive for such meetings. That thin veil had been lately torn away, and in the face of broad day an attempt had been made directly on the person of the Sovereign. The treasonable speeches and writings which had of late been so assiduously disseminated at public meetings, most particularly called for the interference of Parliament. As one of the King's servants—indeed, he might say as a member of that House—he felt it an indispensable duty to endeavour to check their flagitious tendency."[1]

There existed marked features of coincidence in the incidents of 1795 and 1833; among them, a recent French revolution, political combinations in England, disorderly mobs, seditious publications, and an outrage on the King; and there existed a

[1] Hansard, "Parliamentary History," xxxii. 244.

contrast equally marked in the conduct of the King's Government. In the earlier period there was no feeble oscillation between Conservatism and Radicalism, swinging towards one when the object was to injure the other. Multitudes were as industriously collected in the last as in the first epoch, and inflammatory addresses in speeches and in writings, as carefully diffused. The flimsy pretences were equally conspicuous, but Lord Grenville put them down for the preservation of the monarchy.

In moving the second reading of his Bill, Lord Grenville spoke out with the same determination, and asked, "Could any one doubt that the outrages lately committed against his Majesty's person had a connexion with measures pursued by a class of men who were systematically undermining and endeavouring to destroy the constitution of the country?"

During the debate on the third reading he took a masterly view of the real cause of the disturbances in England. He said, "That the French Revolution was owing to a Government in itself bad, he was ready to admit. He would admit also that the dissolute manners of the Court, and the wasteful expenditure of the public money, were undoubtedly the chief causes of that revolution; a revolution which, so far from its being depreciated by the Government of this country, was regarded by them in a favourable point of view, as it afforded a prospect of increasing the felicity of a great

nation, and of contributing to the continuance of the tranquillity then subsisting throughout Europe. So far, it was a revolution that every good man must approve; he had long wished it a happy termination, and happy would it have been had it proceeded on the principle with which it set out. But what brought on all the plunders, assassinations, blood, and horror that afterwards desolated France was *the system maintained by clubs and various public meetings* which took place."

Then going straight to the real evil, he added, "Political assemblies, it was well known, had been held in England, which openly professed to imitate the clubs in France. Their publications, their doctrines, and the principles they avowed, were similar, and similar consequences were to be apprehended and guarded against. If they were suffered to continue scattering firebrands where there was much combustible matter, their lordships and his Majesty's Ministers would have to answer to themselves and to their country for the effects that might follow."[1]

The result of this spirited appeal was, there were only five non-contents to the passing of the Bill, and two proxies, three of whom thought it necessary to enter a protest on the Journals.

In the subsequent debate on the Seditious Meetings Bill (December 9), Lord Grenville addressed himself as eloquently against such meetings. There

[1] Hansard, "Parliamentary History," xxxii. 262.

was greater opposition, the minority rising to fifteen, with six proxies; but the Bill passed its several stages, with another protest.

Lord Grenville's classical attainments were of a high order. Among his labours in this direction was an annotated edition of Homer, privately printed, and a collection of Greek and Latin, as well as of English and Italian poems, written by himself, also privately printed, with the title "Nugæ Metricæ." He defended the University of Oxford, in a pamphlet, from the charge of having expelled Locke, and edited the letters of the Earl of Chatham to his nephew, Thomas Pitt, Lord Camelford. He also published several pamphlets. Indeed, his literary talents, not less than his eminent political position, made him worthy of the honour conferred upon him in 1810, of Chancellor of the University of Oxford. He had obtained, in 1779, the Chancellor's prize for a composition in Latin verse, and had taken a Bachelor of Arts degree; but nine days after his election as Chancellor he was presented to the degree of D.C.L. by diploma.

"Lord Grenville," adds the memoir from which we have already quoted, "was the contemporary of some of the greatest men that ever adorned this country, yet his abilities were not eclipsed in their presence. As a statesman, he was remarkable for sound practical views. As a speaker, he was perhaps one of the most powerful debaters that ever appeared in the House of Lords. There was a

commanding energy in his delivery as well as in his style, which never failed to arrest the attention and command the admiration even of those who differed from him in sentiment."[1]

No time was lost in electing the Duke of Wellington to fill the Chancellorship left vacant by Lord Grenville's death, his Grace being installed at Apsley House on the 29th of January. Two days later he wrote the following:—

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Strathfieldsaye, Jan. 31, 1834.

My dear Duke,

I am highly flattered by your congratulations upon the honour recently conferred upon me.

I am very sorry that I shall not have the pleasure of seeing you on Monday, and particularly that you will not be in your place in the H. of Lords on Tuesday.

The discussion of the address affords an opportunity of discussing the topics of the day, which the course of business in the H. of Lords will not otherwise give us. I confess that I see little chance of bringing any question forward with advantage.

Matters appear to me to remain in the H. of Commons very much as they did.

We might carry in the Lords a question upon a point of foreign or of home policy. Everybody would admit the truth and justice of our proceeding, would peruse our debate with interest, and abuse the Ministers. But the House of Commons, the King, and his Ministers, would

[1] *Gentleman's Magazine* for March, 1834.

join in a censure of the majority of the H. of Lords, as they did in the last session of Parliament; and not a lord in the Commons would venture to utter a word in our favour, or in support of the cause which we should have espoused.

I concur in your opinion that, as long as this Administration lasts, the mischief continues. I don't think that they will split. My opinion, founded upon long observation, is, that they are under some engagement to each other not to split upon trifles, but to continue to act together in office, although they should not approve of the principle or the detail of what is doing.

I don't think that their retirement from office would improve the state of our affairs, unless it should be followed by a universal persuasion that all that they have been doing for the last three years requires revision. The truth is, that all government in this country is impossible under existing circumstances. I don't care whether it is called monarchy, oligarchy, aristocracy, democracy, or what they please, the Government of the country, the protection of the lives, privileges, and properties of its subjects, and the regulation of the thousand matters which require regulation in our advanced and artificial state of society, are impracticable as long as such a deliberative assembly exists as the House of Commons, with all the powers and privileges which it has amassed in the course of the last two hundred years.

Believe me

Ever yours most sincerely,

WELLINGTON.

The Duke apparently considered himself in a political Torres Vedras, and though invited by the

carelessness of the enemy as well as by his own associates to venture out, as he could see no practical benefit to be derived from a success which could only be temporary and partial, he kept in his own entrenchments. His ideas that the Administration were bound together by a determination to hold office despite of differences of opinion, was doubtless a shrewd guess at the truth; and the manner in which their leader was shortly afterwards got rid of, though apparently opposed to this supposition, proves that their tenacity of official life made them ready to sacrifice a principal member to save their body from dissolution. His idea of the House of Commons, as it then existed, is equally plain spoken.

On the 4th of February, the second session of the reformed Parliament was opened by the King in person, with a speech that referred in congratulatory terms to the effect of the Bill for the abolition of slavery in the British colonies, and stated that the reports made by the different Commissions into municipal corporations, the administration of the poor laws, and ecclesiastical revenues and patronage, could not fail to afford much useful information; then followed assurances of the peace of Europe; the customary economical paragraph on the estimates, and lamentation on the continuance of distress amongst proprietors and occupiers of land; congratulations on the improved state of Ireland, mingled with expressions of deep

regret and just indignation directed against the continuance of attempts to exite the people of that country to demand a repeal of the legislative union. In the concluding paragraph the speech dwelt upon the pernicious agitation that had so long been maintained, and stated that the united and vigorous exertions of the loyal and well affected were imperiously required to enable the Government to put an end to it.

In the House of Lords, during the debate on the address, the Duke of Wellington spoke in disapproval of the King's speech, but the address was agreed to. In the Commons, there was an amendment proposed and negatived by a division of 31 to 191. The consideration of the report on the address on the following day, gave rise to a singular discussion respecting a statement which had been made, that some of the Irish members had expressed different opinions on the Coercion Bill in public and in private. Lord Althorp being required to give an instance, named Mr. Shiel, who gave such an emphatic denial that, on the motion of Sir Francis Burdett, Lord Althorp and himself were taken into custody by the Sergeant-at-Arms. They, however, subsequently gave assurances of their peaceful intentions, and returned to their seats. Mr. O'Connell then moved for a Committee of Inquiry, which was granted. On the 13th he moved for another Committee of Inquiry into the conduct of Baron Smith, an Irish judge, whose political feel-

ings appeared to have run away with his discretion. This was also granted. The following day the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought forward his financial statement, which was approved of by Sir Robert Peel, and the resolutions agreed to. Afterwards, the Committee on the Shiel Inquiry produced their report, which, as it acquitted everybody, gave universal satisfaction.

Sir James Graham introduced the naval estimates on the 17th, and though Mr. Hume proposed a reduction in the number of seamen required, all the resolutions were adopted. Mr. O'Connell, on the 18th, obtained leave to bring in a Bill to amend the law of libel, and afterwards Mr. W. Harvey brought forward a motion for a Select Committee to inquire into the grounds on which the several pensions on the Civil List had been granted. It was opposed by the Government as well as by Sir Robert Peel, but the former, in a division, had only a majority of eight.

On the 21st, the attention of the House was directed to the distressed state of the agricultural interest, by a member who went into details that gave sufficient foundation for the resolution with which he concluded. The Chancellor of the Exchequer opposed the motion, and on a division, Ministers barely escaped from a minority, 292 voting for the motion and 206 against it. In a subsequent division on Sir E. Knatchbull's motion for appointing a Committee to inquire into the charges

Mr. O'Connell had preferred against Baron Smith, they were in a minority of four.

Notwithstanding the see-saw policy of Ministers between the Radicals and Conservatives, they did not obtain the confidence of either. Lord Althorp, however, with a show of spirit, declined to receive a deputation from Westminster to urge a repeal of the assessed taxes. This mischievous agitation was presently thrown into the shade by a more dangerous combination of workmen, not only to raise wages all over the country, but to dictate to their employers how they were to invest their capital, and the amount of profit they were to derive from it.

The appeals that had for some time been made to the working classes, and the gross manner in which they had been flattered into an opinion of their overwhelming influence, were now bearing appropriate fruit, in an organization in which it is impossible to say which feature was the most remarkable, the selfish tyranny or marvellous ignorance exhibited by their rules. One of those foolish demonstrations called "strikes" is too recent to have been forgotten; but arbitrary and senseless as it was pronounced, its objects were moderate compared to those for which similar combinations were arranged in the year 1834. They then commenced on the 8th of March, when the men employed by the London Gas Companies demanded a rise in their wages from 28*s*. to 35*s*. a week, with

two pots of porter each day for each man. This being refused, they all left work. No great inconvenience arose to the public, because their places were speedily filled by men from the country.

On the 6th of March, Mr. Hume brought forward a motion for the repeal of the corn laws, which produced an animated debate that lasted two days. The Government opposed, and on a division, 155 voted for and 312 against it.

On the 17th, six agricultural labourers, two of whom were Methodist preachers, were convicted at Dorchester Assizes of a felony for administering illegal oaths, and for being members of an illegal society; they were sentenced to seven years' transportation. In the course of the investigation it was established that the person sworn was admitted blindfold into a chamber containing the picture of a skeleton and a skull, and that the regulations were similar to those that had been adopted by the trades unions.

The sentence created the greatest excitement among the working population in the kingdom, who appeared to think that the criminals had committed no offence. Immense meetings were held to petition the King in their favour, in London, Birmingham, and other manufacturing towns. On the following day, three thousand workmen in the factories at Leeds struck because their employers had expressed a determination only to employ men

who were not, or had ceased to be, members of the trades unions.

On the 15th of April there was a riot at Oldham; two men who belonged to the trades union of the town having been apprehended, one factory was nearly destroyed and one person killed. A troop of Lancers dispersed the mob. Several of the rioters were taken, subsequently tried, and sentenced to imprisonment from six to eighteen months.

On the 17th, Lord Althorp moved for leave to bring in a Bill to alter and amend the laws relating to the poor; which was agreed to, and read a first time on the 20th. On the 21st, he brought forward a proposal in Committee on church-rates, for their abolition, while the sum of 250,000*l.* was to be raised instead, as a charge on the land tax. Mr. Hume and other members opposed, but in a division it was carried by 256 to 140.

On the 21st, a meeting of the trades unions took place at Copenhagen Fields, for appointing a deputation to present a petition to the Home Secretary for the remission of the sentence on the Dorchester convicts. They afterwards paraded through the principal thoroughfares, to the number, it was said, of twenty-five thousand, to the Home Office; but Lord Melbourne refused to receive the deputation, though he deputed Mr. Philips to state to them, that their petition should be laid before the King if presented in a proper manner. The

procession then proceeded to Kennington Common, where the assemblage dispersed.

On the 28th, there was a strike of the London journeymen tailors, numbering thirteen thousand. Their masters came to a determination not to employ men belonging to trades unions, and after a few weeks, the journeymen were content to return to their work on those terms.

These trades unions and their strikes were becoming an insufferable nuisance; nevertheless, no proper effort was made to put them down. The mischief they created was well known to the Government;[1] their interference with trade, their atrocious oaths, impious ceremonies, desperate tyranny, and secret assassinations, had been brought under their observation; but Ministers could not be stirred to any exhibition of energy for the protection either of the manufacturer, the workman, or the public. Even the following powerful appeal was addressed to them without effect:—

"Those whose lives and property have been endangered by these illegal associations have a right to call on Government to employ some additional means for their suppression. Those who wish for the prosperity of our trade, and what is of far more importance, the prosperity and happiness of the working-classes, should equally desire their extinction. Those who hate oppression should give their

[1] "Character, Object, and Effects of Trades Unions, &c." 8vo. 1834. See also an able article in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for June, 1834.

suffrages for the putting down these most capricious and irresponsible of all despotisms. They are alike hurtful to the workmen who form them, to the capitalists who are the objects of their hostility, and to the public who more remotely feel their effects. Were we asked to give a definition of a trades union, we should say that it is a society whose constitution is the worst of democracies, whose power is based on outrage, whose practice is tyranny, and whose end is self-destruction."[1]

Mr. O'Connell on the 22nd of April moved for a Select Committee to inquire and report on the means by which the dissolution of the Irish Parliament was effected, on the effects of the measure of Union upon Ireland, and upon the labourers in husbandry and operatives in manufactures in England, and on the probable consequences of continuing the legislative Union between England and Ireland. He spoke for six hours. The debate lasted four days. An amendment was proposed by Mr. Spring Rice in another speech that occupied six hours in delivery, suggesting an address to his Majesty by both Houses of Parliament, expressing their determination to maintain the legislative Union inviolate; and on a division 523 voted for the amendment and 38 against it.

The Duke of Wellington's recent election to the Chancellorship of Oxford appears to have induced

[1] "Character, Object, and Effects of Trades Unions, &c," 8vo. 1834.

his Grace to show a little additional parliamentary activity; but more earnest partisans were not quite satisfied with him. The reader will observe in the following letter from a distinguished member of this section of the Conservatives, what was thought of their chief; nevertheless it seems to have been understood that a campaign was about to open:—

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

H. of Lords, April 24, 1834.

My dear Duke,

I have just presented all your petitions, and have stated all you pointed out in your letter. If the Warwickshire disfranchisement and other measures proceed, on which divisions are to take place, I will enter your proxy to-morrow; otherwise I should rather hope you would soon be in your place yourself, as I think there is really a general muster now; and although there is no specific period for any very important question, I entertain no doubt that, as the plot thickens, we shall have field days.

The D. of W. is decidedly more active this session than he was last. His appointment to Oxford has been the cause of his being entirely armed for the Church, and he seems more eager and determined. Brougham made of himself, as you will see, the other night, a more disorderly character than ever. Had you been here, I really think he would have been brought more to shame. But you know we want such spirit as you sometimes show. Durham is ill to-day, so Warwick is put off till Monday. I hear Grey at the dinner yesterday was in great spirits, declaring that the trades unions would die

a natural death. Your view of the desire of the Government to get Conservative support, if they oppose manfully the Mountain, is already manifesting itself, by even what Winchelsea said to-day. Thus the world goes; and I really feel, when I think we ought to fight, that, circumstanced as we are now, we can do little or nothing.

Yours ever, my dear Duke,
Most sincerely,
VANE LONDONDERRY.

On the 28th of April, the Duke of Newcastle in the House of Lords brought the trades unions under their consideration. In reply, Lord Grey said mildly that he regretted their existence, and that Government were ready to put down disorderly meetings, and hoped the unions would die away of themselves. This elicited stern protests from the Marquis of Londonderry and Lord Eldon; even the Lord Chancellor acknowledged that the meetings were illegal, and were likely to produce great mischief. He stated also that there could not remain the shadow of a doubt of the justness of the conviction of the Dorchester labourers; and ended by assuring the House that he was an enemy to trades unions; for of all the worst things and of all the most pernicious devices that could be imagined for the injury of the interests of the working classes, as well as the interests of the country at large, nothing, he said, was half so bad as their existence.

An address to the King in accordance with Mr.

Spring Rice's amendment was subsequently agreed upon; the Duke of Wellington and the Marquis of Londonderry expressing a perfect accordance on the subject with Earl Grey and the Lord Chancellor.

The proposal of a revision of the pension list by Mr. W. H. Hervey in the House of Commons, on the 5th of May, was rejected by a division of 148 to 390.

CHAPTER IV.

[1834.]

INSURRECTION AT LYONS—CONSERVATIVE ACTION IN ENGLAND—THE DUKE OF CUMBERLAND'S DESCRIPTION OF A POLITICAL FESTIVAL—DISUNION IN THE CABINET—MINISTERIAL CHANGES—NEGOTIATIONS—ADDRESSES TO THE KING RESPECTING THE STATE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND—INSTALLATION OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON AT OXFORD—MUSICAL FESTIVAL IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY—RESIGNATION OF LORD ALTHORP AND EARL GREY—LORD ALTHORP RETURNS TO OFFICE, AND RECONSTRUCTION OF THE WHIG MINISTRY.

CHAPTER IV.

The sympathy which existed between Radicalism in England and Republicanism in France was again demonstrated by a French movement in favour of trades unions in some of the large manufacturing towns. A society had recently sprung up styled "Mutuellistes," which had instigated the workmen to proceedings of so illegal a character, that they were prosecuted by the Government. This created so much excitement, that while their trial was going on at Lyons, it was found necessary to place a military guard over the tribunal; then a powerful body of armed workmen were sent to the same place under the pretence of protecting the accused. A collision was a matter of course, which brought on a savagely-contested conflict, that was prolonged for five days, not only with the usual accompaniment, defended barricades, but defended churches, and other naturally strong positions, from which the insurgents could not be dislodged without the free use of artillery. The consequence was, that the city suffered as much as if it had been taken by assault; and the sanguinary results were,

1700 troops killed or wounded, and upwards of 5000 workmen, before order was restored.

Scarcely was this formidable insurrection suppressed when another broke out in Paris, with similar ferocity, on the 13th of April. The workmen appeared in arms, and attacked the military from behind barricades and windows. A large force of regular troops and national guards, that had been held in readiness, quickly put down the movement, but not before several lives had been lost.

The affair was brought before the Chamber of Deputies by M. Guizot, and they subsequently went in a body to address the King. The *Tribune* newspaper was suppressed; many arrests were made; and the Chamber proposed a law on the 14th to punish with death persons using arms against the Government; with fine and imprisonment persons possessing ammunition for such purposes; and with imprisonment for four or ten years those who assisted in erecting barricades. These vigorous measures had a salutary effect. Simultaneous risings had been expected in the provinces, but tranquillity was maintained.

The French Government having been defeated in the Chamber respecting an indemnity of twenty-five millions of francs guaranteed to the United States, several of the Ministers resigned. Those who remained in office were M. Guizot, Minister of Public Instruction; M. Humann, Minister of

Finance; and Marshal Soult, President of the Council and Minister of War. M. Thiers was now appointed Minister of Commerce and Public Works; Martin du Nord, Procureur-General of the Royal Court; and M. Persil, Keeper of the Seals and Minister of Justice.

Intelligence of these occurrences was received with anxiety in England, and the movements of those mischievous associations the trades unions were carefully watched. No demonstrations took place, though many thousands of workmen had thrown themselves out of employment by their "strikes." Ministers, however, began to feel insecure in their positions. As early as January in this year rumours of their division had been in circulation. Indeed, Lord Eldon about the end of the month wrote to his daughter, "We believe here that Grey has tendered his resignation on account of differences in the Cabinet; but the lovers of good places and their emoluments, like other lovers, know how to settle quarrels which they wish had never begun."

Nearly contemporaneously with these symptoms of weakness, their political rivals were once more seen in harmonious combination; the distinction conferred on their acknowledged chief, the Duke of Wellington, by the University of Oxford, having drawn them together. The Duke gave a dinner at Apsley House on being sworn into office, which was attended by their Royal Highnesses the Dukes

of Gloucester and Cumberland, the Duke of Beaufort, Lords Eldon, Sidmouth, and Talbot, and by several other leading members of the same party.

The following communication will show the reader their tactics at this period.

H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CUMBERLAND TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

St. James's, May 8, 1834.

DEAR DUKE,

I postponed writing to you till I could see a little clearer my way, and feel the pulse of the leading men. Londonderry will have informed you that he and myself had a meeting last Monday at Lyndhurst's, when we both spoke our minds most distinctly and completely to *him;* and as far as his opinion goes, I think *he* sees everything as *we* do. He promised faithfully to fix an interview with the D. of W., and as he dines *to-morrow* with me at Kew, I shall then learn all particulars. The Duke, I *heard,* was in town on Thursday, and dined, as Chancellor of the University of Oxford, at the dinner his *colleague,* Lord Camden, gave to the members of the deputation of that University who had come up with that address. As I was *not* invited, though a colleague, I did not even suppose the D. of W. had been invited; and it was the B. of Lincoln, who dined there, and whom I saw at the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, who mentioned to me his having been present on that occasion. Lyndhurst also dined there, so I suppose they must have met prior to the D.'s leaving town, which, upon inquiry this day, I hear he did.

The Festival went off magnificently, and Sir J.

Graham made the *strongest Conservative speech* I think I ever heard upon the maintenance of the Church in its rights, privileges, and possessions, which had a great effect. The victory in Dover has been a vital blow to them, and they now talk of Burdett and John Byng being to be elevated to the peerage, to make an opening for the *widow's mite*. We are in the field, and watch *all* their movements. My opinion is, blow them up *at once; when* and how I care not, provided it be but done.

Yours faithfully,

ERNEST.

The Marquis of Londonderry had recently sold to the Government, for the National Gallery, two fine pictures by Correggio for a large sum, which he had purchased of the Queen of Naples when ambassador at Vienna. They had previously been in the collection of Charles I., and had been sold by the Commissioners of the Commonwealth to an agent of the King of Spain. Murat possessed himself of them during the invasion of that country in the same manner that Marshal Soult procured the bulk of his collection. The grant for their purchase was unanimously voted in the Committee of Supply in the House of Commons on the 10th of April.

The Marquis was evidently a shrewd observer of what was going on among his political rivals; and was quite correct in the conclusion he drew from the appearances he describes in the following letter. The Duke of Wellington, it is evident, though he

had evinced a little more activity than before, did not consider the pear sufficiently ripe, and was still content to wait:—

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

H. of Lords, May 26, 1834.

My dear Duke,

I should have written to you had I been able to give you any further intelligence than the daily newspapers afford. The *on dits* have been various; and all admit, even the members of the Cabinet themselves, that their situation is deplorable. You will have observed what has passed this last week. And one can hardly imagine how any Minister can remain in office and suffer two such indignities as have been heaped upon him (Lord Grey) by his colleagues. Brougham's exhibition on the Pluralities and Residence Bill (of which Grey knew absolutely nothing); and Lieven being recalled on Tuesday by letters to Palmerston, which Grey knew nothing of till Tuesday. In addition, however, to all this, the difficulties in the Commons are so great that their warmest partizans admit they are at a loss what course to take; and my good uncle, Lord C., tells me he *knows* Althorp is only looking for an opportunity to cut and run. I'm told the Government have been beaten again in the Commons this morning. You will also see the *Times* of to-day. And the report is prevalent here (H. of Lords) that Stanley and Graham have resigned. The D. of Richmond was sent for by express from Paris, and he is the only Minister as yet (six o'clock) in the House to-night.

All looks in extreme confusion. Still my own feeling is, things will tide on. The D. of W. is entirely averse

at present, as he tells me, to any approximation, and it seems the *wish* of both—his Grace and Peel—that the session should be got through by these men as most beneficial to the country! If aught occurs to-night that I learn, you shall hear.

Ever yours most sincerely,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

Notwithstanding the strong adhesive motive of self-interest, the bundle of political sticks hung so loosely together, that a complete break-up appeared imminent. The fact is, that, though they could coalesce, they could not agree. If the Reform Parliament had exhibited independent singularities, the Reform Cabinet displayed them more prominently. They played in the same performance very like a provincial company hastily brought together, several assuming the airs of dramatic stars, who were only qualified to play in a pantomime, and all agreeing to call in question the superior qualities of the manager.

Lord Eldon wrote to his daughter on the 27th, "The Ministers were beaten in the House of Commons last night by a majority of sixty-three upon a very important point; but go on they do, and will. This is quite a new way in our history of public conduct." The point referred to was the London and Westminster Bank Bill, which was carried against the Government by a division of 137 to 76.

On the following day, during a debate on the Church Establishment in Ireland, Lord Althorp rose and proposed an adjournment of the House, circumstances which he could not explain having come to his knowledge that rendered such a proceeding necessary. This was agreed to—those not in the secret wondering what was about to take place that was thus mysteriously announced.

Another report from Lord Londonderry's graphic pen will prepare the reader for the catastrophe. Still both the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel "held off," most sagaciously, there is no doubt.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

H. of Lords, May 27, 1834.

My dear Duke,

Reports are various as to what is the state of the enemy's camp, but all agree that there is the devil among the tailors. Some say that Stanley will not move an inch, and supported by Melbourne, Lansdowne, Graham, and Richmond, that it is probable he will carry his point, and John Russell and Co. must give way. Others say that there is to be some management to blink matters for the moment to gain time, and to put off the appropriation question till next session. Others, again, say the King saw none of his Ministers, and knew nothing of their great dissensions till this day at twelve o'clock. While others pretend that Stanley was closeted with the King after the dinner of the Jockey Club yesterday. In short, my dear Duke, you know what the *on dits* are *at a*

crisis in this town, and how hard it is to trace the real truth. But one fact is certain, that nothing but the approach of an explosion could give rise to all that is at this moment promulgated. I regret very much your gout preventing you from coming up, because the matter resolves itself now into this simple question, Can they tide on, and get Parliament up, or must they break up? and if they do break up, what is to succeed? Grey has brought down to-night a petition here, and means to support the Bank against the H. of Commons, and throw out the Bill! What do you think of this?

In a long conversation with the Duke again yesterday, I see plainly he will have nothing to do with any formation; and Peel holds off equally. The Derby and Oaks, Ascot and Oxford, are favourable to the Government for negotiation and management; and my own belief is, of the two chances before us, the most certain of being accomplished will be, that these miserable people will close the session.

I have presented to-day your two petitions. The Bristol one is not arrived to-day. But I will take care of it.

Believe me, my dear Duke,

Yours most sincerely,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

The fact was at last made manifest that there were dissensions in the Government—the subject, Mr. Ward's motion relative to the Irish Church, which was to apply Church property to lay purposes; the dissentients were Mr. Stanley, Sir James Graham, the Duke of Richmond, and the Earl of Ripon, who resigned. Consequently, the following

appointments took place:—Mr. Spring Rice, Secretary for the Colonies; Lord Auckland, First Lord of the Admiralty; Earl of Carlisle, Lord Privy Seal; Mr. Poulett Thompson, President of the Board of Trade. Mr. Francis Baring, Secretary to the Treasury, and Mr. Ellice, the Secretary at War, were announced as having been introduced into the Cabinet.

On the 28th, Lord Eldon wrote, "I hear that Ministers, as to some of whom we heard so positively that they have resigned, have made up their quarrel." This was not quite correct. "The fact seems to be," he continued, "they have by their measures fallen so far short of doing all that the Radicals expected of them, that, if any of them quitted, they could not tell how to get persons to supply their places; and on the other hand, nobody, as a new Ministry, if they all resigned, could undertake the Government. The present Parliament would not support new Ministers, as being altogether, or nearly altogether, Republicans; and new Ministers now—10*l.* householders being so numerous—could not get a House of Commons better than the deplorably bad one we now have."

Lord Eldon was again in error in these statements. We cannot anticipate, but the reader will soon be in possession of the true state of the case.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

H. of Lords, May 30, 1834.

My dear Duke,

You will no doubt hear by this post that all is settled.

Auckland *vice* Sir James Graham.
Spring Rice „ Stanley.
Mulgrave „ Richmond.
Carlisle „ Ripon.

Francis Baring succeeds Spring Rice as Secretary of Treasury; O'Farrell (Moore), of the "tail," Lord of Treasury, *v.* Baring. Durham is pressed to take embassy to Paris, but I hear will not accept. Ellice does not get into Cabinet. These *two* being struck out, and the arrangement being both feeble and hollow, it cannot last long. Sugden starts for Cambridge to-night, and seems confident of throwing out Rice, in which case I suppose they will make him a peer. I think they will certainly get O'Connell, or else who have they in the H. of C.?

It is a fearful crisis, but may soon bring the country and reformers to their senses.

I will write more fully to-morrow. I have your petitions.

Ever yours most sincerely,

Vane Londonderry.

Lord Althorp, on the 2nd of June, informed the House of Commons what had taken place, and proposed for the vexed question of Church property the favourite Ministerial expedient—a "commission." Mr. Ward nevertheless pressed his motion, and Mr.

37267

O'Connell attacked the Government for its vacillating conduct. On a division, the motion was lost by 396 against 120, the Conservatives voting with Ministers.

In the House of Lords, a debate on the same subject took place on the 6th, when the Earl of Eldon denied the right of the State to apply Church property to any other purpose than the one originally intended; and the Dukes of Wellington and Cumberland, as well as other peers, strongly objected to the proposed Commission.

The Poor Laws Amendment Bill and the Bill for the Admission of Dissenters into the Universities created much discussion in the House of Commons, but the divisions were in favour of Ministers.

A great Conservative demonstration was made at Oxford on the 10th of June, caused by the installation of the Duke of Wellington as Chancellor. Nothing could exceed the enthusiasm with which his Grace was received, or the desire to do him honour. We subjoin a report from an eye-witness. It appears that a communication had been written by the Duke of Buckingham respecting political affairs.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Holdernesse House, June 13, 1834.

My dear Duke,

I returned late last night from Oxford. Nothing could surpass the enthusiasm and intoxication of the reception. It was beyond our most sanguine expectations, even for the D. of Cumberland. I shall see the D. of Wellington on his return, and will talk your last letter over with him, and let you know what he says. *Au reste,* a crisis cannot be very far distant. Something of change must happen. My plan, therefore, is only to draw out the Duke by saying I had heard from you, that you resent these people still remaining in, and that I don't think you lean to any confidence in Sir R. Peel's *individual* career.

If you have further wishes, let me know. But although I am often imprudent for myself, I hate to be so for my friends.

We shall have much next week. The Commons debated again Westminster Borough, Jews, Silk Trade, &c. &c. But I hear Grey determines to get up Parliament *coute qui coute.* Spring Rice's success is a damper. The Duke, in a convocation, discountenanced the Oxford address, thanking his Majesty for the speech to the bishops, on the grounds that Grey would then be forced to make the King disavow it.

I will write when I hear more next week.

Ever yours most sincerely,

Vane Londonderry.

The interest excited by the Government measures affecting the Church was general in clergy

and laity. At a levee held on the 27th of May, an address, numerously signed by noblemen and gentlemen, was presented to the King, which was graciously received. On the following day, the anniversary of his Majesty's birthday, another address was presented by the Irish prelates, headed by the Archbishop of Armagh, deprecating ecclesiastical innovations in powerful language. The King, in answer, warmly expressed his attachment to the Church in which he had been educated, and acknowledged how much his family had been indebted to the Revolution of 1688. In conclusion, his Majesty said, "The words which you hear from me are spoken from my mouth, but proceed from my heart."

On the 3rd of June, Lord Bexley and other distinguished Protestants who had signed the lay address, waited on the Archbishop of Canterbury, at Lambeth Palace, to offer their congratulations on their sentiments of devotion to the Protestant Church having become so widely diffused, and to deposit a declaration of this among the archives in the palace. In his reply, the Archbishop said, "Amidst the perils which are multiplying around us, the clergy will derive the greatest encouragement to persevering exertion from these public professions of your devoted adherence to the Church, and your implied approbation of the character and conduct of its ministers. While such are the sentiments of the wisest and best among our fellow-

countrymen, we may look forward with hope, and whatever may be the event of the hostility with which we are threatened, we shall find consolation in their sympathy, and in the consciousness of not being altogether unworthy of it."

Lord Eldon has preserved an amusing account of a debate that occurred in the House of Lords on the 6th of June. "The nature of the motion, which was made by Lord Wicklow in a very good speech, naturally introduced as combatants upon the floor the Ministers who remained in and the Ministers who had gone out. They talked of their feelings of kindness for each other as if they had been sweethearts parted. Lord Grey talked as if he meant that the Protestant Church of Ireland should divide good things with another Church in Ireland. The ex-Ministers insisted against any of the good things of the Church, if there was ever so much too much belonging to it, being taken from it. Grey insisted that the State had a right to dispose of what the Church had too much, as the State thought proper."

The installation at Oxford appeared to have been almost as complimentary to Lord Eldon as to the Duke of Wellington, for the venerable advocate of Protestant principles received from the eminently Protestant community then and there assembled the warmest demonstrations of respect and applause; and in an extraordinary and affecting manner was their enthusiastic sympathy awakened, when his

grandson, Lord Encombe, received his Doctor's degree, and was presented by the Law Professor to the Chancellor.

The Court were much occupied this summer by a grand musical festival that had been for some time in preparation, and which the King, the Queen, nearly all the royal family, and most of the nobility and gentry in London encouraged. The interior of the ancient Minster was fitted up with seats on the floor of the nave within the aisles, and with raised galleries and orchestra, opposite to which, at the extremity of the seats, a handsome apartment with wings was fitted for the royal visitors. Here their Majesties, the Princess Victoria, the Duchess of Kent, and the Princess Augusta, sat in front; and the Dukes of Gloucester, and Meiningen, the younger Princes of the royal family, and the chief officers of the household, occupied places at the back; the wings were filled with lords in waiting, aides-de-camp, and other official attendants, and in front sat the Directors, with whom were the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, as well as other distinguished prelates. Every seat was taken, and among the fashionable and brilliant assemblage thus gathered together, the appearance of the Princess Victoria excited the deepest interest. Equally marked was the recognition of the Duke of Wellington.

These performances continued for four days; the finest sacred compositions were sung or played by

the best vocal and instrumental musical talent the country could produce, the number of performers with the chorus being six hundred and twenty-five. The amount was 22,000*l.*; the profits were divided between the Royal Society of Musicians, the New Musical Fund, the Royal Academy of Music, and the Choral Fund.

On the 23rd of June, the House of Lords threw out the Disabilities of the Jews Bill, on a division of 130 against 38. The same day, in the House of Commons, Mr. Littleton moved for the recommittal of the Irish Tithes Bill. Mr. O'Connell attacked it in a violent speech, concluding with an amendment that disposed of a portion of the funds of the Established Church. It was negatived in a division of 360 against 99. The third reading of the Poor Laws Amendment Bill was carried on the 1st of July, and read a first time in the House of Lords on the following day.

On the 3rd, Mr. O'Connell and the Secretary for Ireland, Mr. Littleton, entered into a warm discussion respecting the renewal of the Coercion Bill, the second reading of which passed the House of Lords on the following day. The Irish Church Temporalities Bill went into Committee in the House of Commons, when Sir Robert Peel strongly condemned the wavering conduct of Ministers, declaring that it was calculated to destroy all confidence in the Government and in Parliament.

It soon became evident that he did not stand alone in his opinion; indeed, the ablest and most honest members of the Government at last began to find that they could not creditably continue in office. Lord Althorp was the first to resign; his example was immediately followed by Earl Grey. The latter on the 9th of July in the House of Lords made a statement which proved the truth of long-existing rumours—the existence of divisions in the Cabinet, and of a state of singular want of harmony among other members of the Administration. The Duke of Wellington admitted that Lord Grey had explained the cause of his own resignation, but had not been as explicit respecting that of his colleague, and disclaimed all personal hostility in the opposition he had been obliged to make to his Government. The Lord Chancellor addressed a moving eulogium on the departing Minister, and expressed his determination to remain in office.

The same day, in the House of Commons, Lord Althorp made his explanation, in which it appeared that certain communications made by the Irish Secretary to Mr. O'Connell on the Coercion Bill had rendered his resignation imperative. Mr. Littleton acknowledged that he had committed two errors—the first in having communicated with Mr. O'Connell without the sanction of the head of the Government; and the last and greater error of having placed confidence in a person so ill deserving of it. Mr. O'Connell put forward as an excuse his

desire to preserve his country from danger. Mr. Hume lamented the resignation of Lord Althorp, but was confident that an Administration must be formed on the liberal principles he had entertained. There was evidently "balm in Gilead," but what it was did not appear to the uninitiated. The House was adjourned from the 10th to the 14th, and then to the 17th.

Earl Grey's popular Administration had lasted three years seven months and twenty-two days. Its existence had been prolonged to that duration by the most extraordinary political manœuvres that had ever been attempted; but a very singular circumstance in its history is, that the cause of its creation was that of its premature dissolution. The reformed Parliament, to produce which it had been organized, had, early in its second session, necessitated its decapitation. The Conservative party had had nothing to do with this loss of its head; for Lord Grey was not driven out of the Cabinet by their opposition; nor had the Radicals anything beyond an ostensible agency in the catastrophe. As far as could be ascertained from the best authorities, the Government had suffered from internal convulsions, and the chief member of the body dropped off from political gangrene.

Lord Althorp's resignation produced that of his chief; but Earl Grey having been got rid of, Lord Althorp resumed office. The Administration was reconstructed with a new head and a new arrange-

ment of the principal members, after the following fashion:—

Viscount Melbourne	*First Lord of the Treasury.*
Viscount Althorp	*Chancellor of the Exchequer.*
Lord Brougham	*Lord Chancellor.*
The Marquis of Lansdowne . .	*President of the Council.*
Earl Mulgrave	*Lord Privy Seal.*
Viscount Duncannon	*Home Secretary.*
Viscount Palmerston	*Foreign Secretary.*
Right Honourable Spring Rice .	*Colonial Secretary.*
Lord Auckland	*First Lord of the Admiralty.*
Right Honourable Charles Grant	*President of the Board of Control.*
Marquis Conyngham	*Postmaster-General.*
Lord Holland	*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.*
Lord John Russell	*Paymaster of the Forces.*
Right Honourable E. J. Littleton	*Secretary for Ireland.*

Such were the materials of the new Government, which could boast of nothing new in its composition, and as little in its character. It did not possess the familiar recommendation of being "old friends with new faces;" it was merely old friends with new places. The political kaleidoscope had revolved; and the little bits of bright Whiggery, and the small particles of transparent Radicalism at the bottom of the tube, had arranged themselves for new combinations of reform till the nation should become sensible of the uselessness of the toy.

Neither the Duke of Wellington nor Sir Robert Peel made any demonstration at this juncture, though doubtless fully aware of the significance of Earl Grey's removal. The pear was ripening, and they could afford to wait.

CHAPTER V.

[1834.]

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON EXHIBITS MORE POLITICAL ACTIVITY—MEETINGS OF CONSERVATIVE PEERS AT APSLEY HOUSE—THEIR INTENTIONS DESCRIBED BY THE DUKE OF CUMBERLAND AND THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY—PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT—ASSASSINATION EXCITED BY TRADES UNIONS—RADICAL DEMONSTRATION AT EDINBURGH—LORD DURHAM AT WYNYARD PARK—HIS PORTRAIT—CONFLAGRATION OF THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT—INCREASE OF INCENDIARISM—DEATHS OF ILLUSTRIOUS MEN—STATE OF THE GOVERNMENT.

CHAPTER V.

THE new arrangement of the Government did not appear to have created much confidence in the House of Commons; for on the 30th of July Mr. O'Connell in Committee on the Irish Tithe Bill proposed an amendment that went to cut off at least forty per cent. of the tithes payable in Ireland; nevertheless, it was carried against Ministers on a division of 82 against 33.

A great number of addresses had been presented to the King during the month expressive of gratitude for his Majesty's recent declaration in favour of the Church; indeed, a strong Conservative feeling was beginning to manifest itself among persons of intelligence and property throughout the kingdom. The Duke of Wellington came forward more publicly, and was invariably well received.

The Whigs went on quietly in their course. Sir John Cam Hobhouse was appointed Chief Commissioner of Woods and Forests, and Viscount Duncannon created a peer of the United Kingdom.

There was another lull in the stormy elements of French politics; and on the 31st of July the King

opened the Chambers after the elections with much outward appearance of popularity. His speech congratulated the nation on the existing tranquillity, announced increasing commerce, and prophesied extension of trade. After stating the conclusion of difficulties in Portugal, it referred to the commencement of others in Spain, and concluded with a determination to preserve the institutions of France, and to rally all good Frenchmen round the throne and the charters. There was very little discussion in the Chamber of Deputies, and the address was carried by a large majority. The *fêtes* of July in commemoration of "the three glorious days" were restricted to two, and owing to the disposal of a large body of troops passed off quietly.

The Earl of Radnor, on the 1st of August, in the House of Lords, moved the second reading of the Bill for the Admission of Dissenters into the Universities, when H.R.H. the Duke of Gloucester, the Duke of Wellington, and the Archbishop of Canterbury spoke strongly against the measure, which, though supported by Lords Melbourne and Brougham, was lost on a division, 187 peers voting against it and 85 for it.[1] The result is well described in the next letter. It will be seen that the Duke of Wellington had now determined on action; and, like the skilful general he was, reviewed his forces that he might judge of their efficiency for service.

[1] Hansard.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Holdernesse House, August 2, 1834.

My dear Duke,

Our spanking majority last night has put us, I think, all in spirits; and really *both* Chancellors of the Universities spoke well, manfully, and creditably. I rather think the Government, as they knew they would be weak, considered it the best *tactique* to be *excessively* so, and to take no pains in whipping. One can in no other way account for so many of their absentees.

Our meeting took place to-day at twelve, at the Duke's. It was merely an *omnium gatherum* of all the party. I should think fifty or sixty attended. There were no bishops; but *all waverers*—and it embraced from the Dukes of Cumberland and Gloucester down to A*******, K*******, &c. &c.—in short, it was the whole party. We met in the great gallery.

The Duke said he had assembled us to know the course desired or wished by noble lords for the remainder of the session. He full well knew, and we had shown last night, what a strong Conservative party we were in the country. But it was absolutely necessary for the remainder of the session to keep together, if we meant to do anything, and to have peers to hold proxies; as, if all were going (as his Grace had heard), there must be an end of everything.

It seemed evident by this exordium that we were met to give pledges to remain in town to the end of the session. D. of Gloucester and Cumberland both declared their readiness to remain until they received his Grace's acquiescence to their departure. *F******* next declared the same. C********** and some others ditto. The Duke

then said the course to be pursued on the Irish Tithe Bill was the most important question, and suggested how it was to be dealt with; and likewise that the Foreign Enlistment Bill would require attendance. D. of Cumberland objected to any idea of the Tithe Bill being allowed to go into Committee, knowing what Committees in our House produced. Billy of Gloucester was rather for Committee. Kenyon then pressed the Duke *home* as to throwing out the Bill on the second reading. The Duke then said he should be mainly guided by the sentiments of the bishops. This seemed to satisfy even the *ultras* of the meeting. D. of Cumberland said to me, he was privately sure *this assurance* was all that we need desire.

I expressed your regret at not being able to attend the meeting; and I read the short sentence in your letter expressive of your sentiments of a decided line in throwing out the Bill.

I believe I have now given you everything that passed. L******* said a few words corroborative of our views; and R****** stated he thought we should have the Tithe Bill up after Monday week. Many pressed me to write to you to come up for the battle, and I do hope you will be able to accomplish it.

The Duke of W. was in good spirits, and undoubtedly seems taking now more pains, and showing all that he is more anxious and solicitous for their support and aid, than he was at the close of last session. I dined to-day at Kew, where there is a large political party. You shall hear on Monday if anything further transpires.

Ever yours most sincerely,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

The Duke's reserve had at last given way; he

had observed the weakness in the enemy's position, and having become thoroughly acquainted with his own strength, made preparations for issuing from his lines. There appeared to be a tolerable degree of harmony established amongst the Conservative body who had attended the meeting at Apsley House; all seemed willing to accept the Duke, provided he would be explicit in declaring his policy; and in deference to that feeling the Duke spoke out with his old clearness and determination. By his inducing the peers to promise to remain in town for the remainder of the session, he shadowed forth an intention of making an attack before it terminated; and this was quite sufficient to put them in the best possible disposition with themselves and their leader. They believed their Waterloo was at hand; indeed, some apparently thinking it nearly won, seemed to imagine that they had heard the familiar address, "Up guards, and at 'em!"

The Irish Tithe Bill and Irish Church Temporalities Bill were read a third time in the House of Commons on the 5th of August and passed. These measures, however, were regarded by the Conservative party as extremely objectionable, and an active opposition was intended in the Lords. How the Duke of Wellington succeeded in organizing this opposition has already been seen; but the share other influential leaders of the party had in it must also be described.

H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CUMBERLAND TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

St. James's Palace, August 7, 1834.

My dear Duke,

I believe you cannot have one single moment's doubt on your mind that, as far as I am concerned, I shall never be a party to compromise principle to expediency; and this has ever been my line of conduct over upwards of thirty-six years that I have sat in the House of Lords; and I do not think that at my time of life I am likely myself to change or to recommend others to do so; but unless circumstances have occurred since the last twenty-four hours, I believe the plan is *fixed* and *determined* to *reject* the Bill on the second reading, which is fixed for next *Monday*, the *eleventh*. I mentioned to you in a former letter that at the meeting at A.H. last Saturday, the Duke stated, as far as his own *private opinions* and *feelings* went, he should be for rejecting the Bill, but that he did not wish to pledge himself till he knew precisely the opinion of the Primate and bench of bishops; and I heard *late* last night that the Primate and the other Irish bishops were *all* and *one* against the Bill, even the Bishop of *Derry* (Lord Grey's brother-in-law). As to amending the Bill, it is totally out of the question; as I am told by those who have seen it as it came out of the House of Commons, that *every clause* therein has the character of a moneyed clause. This of itself, therefore, must at once annihilate all idea of that nature. The grants were to be laid this day on the table, and I will direct a copy to be forwarded to you by this evening's post. Should any alteration take place, and the *plan* of *operation* be in any way altered, you shall hear from me again.

I see by the muster just received that the Church Temporalities (Irish) is to be read a second time, to-morrow: that also was brought up only *yesterday*, with the Foreign Enlistment Bill. ALL these, *cum multis aliis*, brought up *en masse*, are to be hurried through. Is this treating the Lords with respect, or doing justice to the country? My opinion is, the Lords must throw out the Irish Tithe Bill, or they must shut up their House.

Believe me, dear Duke,

Yours very faithfully,

ERNEST.

His Grace the Duke of Buckingham, K.G.

There was another meeting of the political friends of the Duke of Wellington at Apsley House on the same day as the date of the preceding letter, of which we have the following report:—

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

H. House, August 8, 1834.

MY DEAR DUKE,

We had a very large meeting at the Duke's to-day. Roden and others are come over on purpose. It was unanimously decided to reject the Bill. Ellenborough moves it. Harrowby and Wharncliffe both tried to frame and throw doubts and difficulties; however, they were not supported, and the feeling seemed to be *united* and firm.

I am going to Lord Camden's, into Kent, to-morrow; so I shall not be in town till Monday; when, as the Duke of Cumberland says he has written again, I shall hope to see you.

D******** publicly declares that if the Bill is thrown out, he will take care that there is not a soldier or policeman that shall aid or assist in collecting any tithe in Ireland. This is a tolerable threat of a Secretary of State abandoning the government of the country and the law of the land at his own will and pleasure.

In haste, every yours most sincerely,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

On the 11th of August, Lord Melbourne proposed the second reading of the Irish Tithe Bill, after which the Duke of Wellington made severe remarks on the policy of the Government in Ireland, saying, "If they had met the disturbances with energy—if they had carried into effect the Proclamation Act—if they had renewed it when they ought—if they had not given patents of precedence to a gentleman who had been convicted of a misdemeanour—if they had omitted to reward the gentleman who had flown in the face of his Majesty, they would have put an end to these tithe disturbances; and if they had done that, we should not have been in the state in which we find ourselves at the present moment."

The Bishop of London strongly expressed himself against the second reading, and the Earl of Roden described the Bill as a crafty attempt to destroy the Protestant religion in Ireland. The Earl of Ellenborough and Lord Mansfield also spoke well on the subject. The Bill was lost by a con-

siderable majority; the division being 189 against and 122 for the second reading. We append the following reports of the debate, from eye and ear witnesses.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

House of Lords, Aug. 12, 1832.

My dear Duke,

I do not think our division was quite as large as was expected; however, it was sufficient to leave us all in good spirits. We had the debate entirely our own way. Ellenborough and Mansfield made really fine speeches. B******* never was so weak and puerile, and his whole reasoning was false and beneath anything he ever before attempted. Melbourne was very poor, he could hardly get on; and D******** is beyond the beyonds, *bad*. I have not heard what effect the division has had on the Commons; O'Connell is fortunately in Ireland, and I think there will be no stir, as Althorp is very sick of his position, and Littleton quite downcast and beat. To-morrow may produce some news; if so, I shall write. They say we prorogue on Friday; I shall leave town on that evening or Saturday; I go first to Lord Barrington's, in Berkshire; and then to Chesterfield's, at Bretby; I will write, however, again ere I go, and give you all I pick up.

Ever yours most sincerely,

Vane Londonderry.

P.S.—Grey not in the House—proxy given by Melbourne. Durham's proxy ditto, by Jockey of Norfolk.

H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CUMBERLAND TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

London, Aug. 13, 1834.

DEAR DUKE,

It was utterly impossible for me yesterday to write to you, as I had not one idle moment from twelve till half-past nine, when I got home from the House.

I hope you are satisfied with our Monday's debate, never did I hear Mansfield speak more beautifully; so did Ellenborough; Wellington, and Roden; but nothing could be more wretched, weak, or miserable, than H. M.'s Ministers, except Brougham, who certainly *amused* us, though the debate was not the most amusing, and the argument *all* on our side.

A sharp debate is expected this evening in the Commons. Parliament, they say, is to be prorogued on Friday. Codrington has succeeded in Gloucestershire.

Ever, dear Duke,

Yours very faithfully,

E.

On the 15th of August, both Houses were prorogued by his Majesty in person, with a speech lamenting the postponement of a final settlement between Holland and Belgium, expressing lively satisfaction at the termination of the civil war in Portugal, and disappointment at the state of affairs in Spain. Then followed a reference to the recently established commissions, a wish that the authority with which they were invested would be exercised

with temperance and caution, and an expression of rejoicing for the amendment of the law. The concluding paragraphs were much as usual.

So ended another session of the reformed Parliament, and not more gladly did the victim of superstition immortalized in a certain humorous poem, terminate his uncomfortable pilgrimage, and divest his shoes of the instruments of his penance, than did Lord Melbourne terminate the sittings of the House of Peers. Manifestations of public opinion had, however, not been confined to that assembly. The state of society at the other extremity of the social scale was infinitely less satisfactory. Strikes and combinations continued, with an occasional assassination that disclosed the fearful demoralization which existed in that portion of the community.

At Chester assizes on the 5th of August, two men were indicted for the murder of a manufacturer during a strike in 1831. It appeared on evidence, that the deceased had excited the ill feelings of the trades unions of the place where he held a mill, in which he afforded employment to a great number of people; and that two of his workmen, at their instigation, and for a bribe of 3*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* each, paid by them, shot him as he was passing through a lane to his mill. They were found guilty, and subsequently executed at Horsemonger-lane.

On the 18th, the workmen employed by the builders of London struck, in consequence of a

declaration published by their masters requiring them to abandon the trades unions. They amounted to ten thousand, including the artisans at the Government works. Though a good deal of inconvenience was incurred, the chief sufferers, as was always the case in these instances, were the men on strike.

For some weeks nothing very important occurred in either political camp, but the following communication conveys a lively picture of the state of the Whig party. A grand demonstration in the form of a public dinner had been got up in Edinburgh on the 15th, in favour of Earl Grey. The Lord Chancellor and Lord Durham were also present, with several Scottish noblemen, and the banquet was attended by nearly fifteen hundred persons. There was much speech-making afterwards, principally in favour of reform; but Lord Durham strongly insisted on the advantages of voting by ballot and the household suffrage.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Wynyard Park, Sept. 3, 1834.

MY DEAR DUKE,

I have not written to you since the close of the session, and during the progress of a tour of visits we made to Lord Barrington's, Chesterfield's, D. of Rutland's, &c., because of political news or anecdote I had nothing but what the journals afforded. I have been at home about

ten days, and strange to say, my first visit has been from D*****; we asked him to meet the Frederick Fitz-Clarences for a day, in a formal note, and he has stayed on five or six days. He is very agreeable in private when he chooses it, and is not sparing of his information. I am of opinion, however, that *this sojourn* will cause a good deal of talk in the county. My correspondents write, "Miracles will never cease—Lord D***** at Wynyard!" However, I think neither he is, nor I am of the Ripon or Downshire breeds; I feel not the most remote hope of making him Conservative, nor do I believe he will make me Radical—but Radical he is not.

His history with Grey is this:—D***** pledged himself to Nesselrode that Stratford Canning's appointment should be cancelled; Palmerston supported his own nomination, and alleged to Grey his party aided in carrying reform, and he was bound to uphold Canning's nomination. Grey had to choose between D*****'s resignation, or rather secession, or Palmerston's, and feeling gratitude for the Canning section's support of the Bill, he retained Palmerston, and abandoned D*****, since when, D***** has been "none of my child" with any of the present Administration. I think he was very sore he was not consulted or considered, and came early to the north to be out of the way.

Mortified chiefs come together, and so Lord Grey put up at L—— on his way to Howick, and the scene was got up which you have seen. D***** is certainly not without hopes that Melbourne will make some particular arrangement for him; but I think in this he deceives himself; and unless this does occur, I know no chance he has of official life again, until Princess Victoria mounts

the throne. He makes me believe his intercourse is very confidential with the Duchess.

I urged him fairly to tell me what he thought would be the issue of the present conflict between the two Houses, and how matters were to end. He told me that he had undoubtedly urged Lord Grey upon the second reading of the Reform Bill to make peers, and to have made them from the Commoners of large fortunes. Lord Grey, however, resisted. But the case now was very different; making peers would not strengthen the Ministry in the H. of Lords, they would lose as many as they might create, and the only alternative to expect was, that the Houses of Parliament, tired by continual conflict, would feel the wisdom of putting an end to it; and this would be accomplished by working upon the opinions and sentiments of a sufficient quantity of peers to stay away from their duties, as they did on the Reform Bill, and thus to allow such measures as Lord Althorp's fiats to become the law of the land. I told him I thought he counted ill on the spirit that now prevails amongst the Conservatives in the H. of Lords, and I did not imagine they would be tired out. It is rather curious thus to know what I really believe is the speculation of the Grey calculation. I discover also that D. is far from cordial with B********; he denies ever having had a *private* conference with him on any subject; he abuses strongly his carrying the great seal to Scotland, merely to get asked to the Grey dinner, and to *out-Herod* Herod there. In short, I think D*****'s prospects for official life and employment are about as bad as that of any of the Conservatives.

O'Connell seems to have taken his line of peace in

Ireland, and I have no doubt the Coercion Bill will do very well without the clauses.

There will be no chance of Parliament meeting before February.

I shall go to Ireland in October for three or four weeks, and I will write what I hear in Paddy's land.

Ever yours most sincerely,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

On the 16th of October, the Houses of Parliament were consumed by fire. The flames were seen about half-past six o'clock in the evening near the entrance of the two Houses, and by seven the whole structure was one vast conflagration. By great exertions the venerable hall was preserved, but the two Houses were completely consumed. On the following day, their Majesties, who had come to town on hearing the intelligence, attended by the Earl and Countess of Errol, the Earl of Munster, Lords Adolphus and Frederick Fitzclarence, and several other noblemen, arrived in two private carriages. They surveyed the melancholy ruins of the ancient Painted Chamber of St. Stephen's Chapel of the House of Lords, where the fine tapestry commemorating the defeat of the Spanish Armada had been destroyed, of the Committee-rooms of both Houses, of the galleries and lobbies, and of the journal office, Speaker's house, and library of the House of Commons; then their

Majesties went to St. James's Palace, and subsequently returned to Windsor.

On the 22nd, there was a very full meeting to inquire into the origin of the fire. This was supposed to have originated in the overheating of the flues by burning a large quantity of Exchequer tallies improperly entrusted by the clerk of the works to a mechanic. It should be borne in mind that the men employed by the London builders, including those usually in the service of Government, were on strike, and the feeling which had been displayed by the trades unions on more than one occasion, gave grounds in some minds for the suspicion that the fire had not been accidental; nothing, however, could be proved beyond culpable negligence.

Incendiary fires were at this period of frequent occurrence.

Several distinguished men died during the summer and autumn. On the 26th of July, in his seventy-second year, the Right Hon. Henry, third Earl Bathurst, son of Lord Chancellor Bathurst. When Lord Apsley, in 1783, in which year he entered Parliament, having been returned for the family borough, Cirencester, he was appointed a Commissioner of the Admiralty, and in 1789 of the Treasury. The following year he succeeded the Earl of Hardwicke as one of the Tellers of the Exchequer, of which office he had obtained the

reversion; and in 1793 became one of the Commissioners for the Affairs of India, and was sworn of the Privy Council. He went up to the House of Lords on the death of his father, August 6th, 1794. His official career now advanced rapidly. In 1804 he was appointed Master of the Mint; in 1807 President of the Board of Trade; and in 1809 Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The last office he held only two months.

In 1812 he became Secretary for the Colonies, which post he maintained nearly sixteen years; and in 1828 was named President of the Council, but resigned with the Wellington Administration two years later. Lord Bathurst had been a Knight of the Garter since 1817, and enjoyed another distinction, which he equally prized, that of being the only civilian invited to the annual banquet given by the Duke of Wellington on the anniversary of Waterloo.

Telford the engineer and Coleridge the poet closed their earthly career at nearly the same period—the illustrious artificer of those grand national works the Caledonian Canal, the Conway Bridge, the Holyhead Road, and the Menai Bridge, died on the 2nd of September, and found an appropriate resting-place in Westminster Abbey; the author of "Christabel," and other well-known imaginative works, died the day preceding the demise of Lord Bathurst.

Death had also been busy in other lands. Among his victims must be named Jean Baptiste de Chavigny, Duc de Cadore, Minister of the Emperor Napoleon I. He succeeded Bernadotte in 1801 in the embassy to Vienna, was Minister of the Interior from 1804 to 1807, and for Foreign Affairs from this period to 1811. He subsequently negotiated the marriage of Napoleon with Maria Louisa, was created a Duke, and entrusted with the management of the Imperial domains. At the first Restoration he was made a peer; but having assisted Napoleon during the Hundred Days, on the return of the Bourbons he was deprived of his title, which, however, was restored in 1819. He died at Paris in July at the age of seventy-eight, after having taken service under every Government in France from Louis XVI. to Louis Philippe.

On the 20th of the preceding May, France lost a still more celebrated political character, General the Marquis de Lafayette. In early life, he had assisted the revolted American colony to throw off its allegiance to England, and served in its army as a major-general. When he returned to France he was received by the Court with the greatest enthusiasm for the part he had played in assisting to humble a rival Power; he had also a most favourable reception from a party among his own countrymen to whom his achievements for American independence had a much more genuine attraction.

That the favours conferred by the Court of France on a Republican hero assisted materially in bringing about its own annihilation, must be well known, as well as the part he played in the destructive Revolution. During the Empire, Lafayette was content with a life of quiet, but the Revolution of July, 1830, brought him again prominently forward at the head of the national guard, and he became at once the chief of the Republican party. A man less qualified to maintain such a dangerous post, however, could scarcely have been found in the country. He was vain, frivolous, and theatrical, with a mild disposition and a weak mind. After the King of the French had established his power, he again went into retirement. He received the homage of a public funeral.

On the 4th of September died Donna Francisca, daughter of John King of Portugal, and wife of Don Carlos, then Infante of Spain. Late events in that country had made her a fugitive in England; and she died at the age of thirty-four, at Alverstoke Rectory, titular Queen of Spain. After the demise of the Queen, his Majesty William IV. sent a letter of condolence to her sister, the Princess of Beira, by Sir Herbert Taylor.

On the 24th of the same month, in his thirty-sixth year, died Don Pedro d'Alcantara, Duke of Braganza, Regent of Portugal, and late Emperor of the Brazils. Though his life had been fruitful in adven-

ture, for he had abdicated sovereignty twice, and had acquired it three times, besides inheriting it—first for himself, next for his son, and lastly for his daughter, Donna Maria—he died in the Palace of Quetoz in Lisbon, and received a royal funeral. His entire career proved him to be a man of little talent and less principle.

The English Government gave very little sign of its existence after the prorogation of Parliament. People knew that the Whigs were in power, and it seemed to be generally understood that Lord Melbourne was at the head of the Cabinet; but after the extraordinary excitement that had been exhibited by the nation in their favour only a short time ago, nothing could be more extraordinary than the public apathy respecting them that now prevailed. The unusually high tide of public opinion that had borne them into power had ebbed to such an extent as to leave them stranded on the shore, without the prospect of getting again afloat.

Yet so ignorant were some of their political opponents of their true position, that Sir Robert Peel had left the country on a continental tour; and other influential members of the same party had been enjoying their usual autumnal recreations far from the capital, as little imagining the immediate dissolution of the Government, as anticipating the conflagration of the Houses of Parliament. There was one more watchful observer, who appears

to have maintained his post sufficiently near to the scene of action to take advantage of any contingency. He seems also to have been aware that the change of opinion just referred to was not confined to the King's subjects. In other words, he saw that the pear seemed nearly ripe.

CHAPTER VI.

[1834.]

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONERS SENT TO INQUIRE INTO THE OPERATION OF THE POOR LAWS.—DEATH OF EARL SPENCER—THE KING DISMISSES HIS MINISTERS—SIR ROBERT PEEL SENT FOR—THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON ACCEPTS A TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT—THE DUKE'S DESCRIPTION OF THE DISSOLUTION OF THE LATE GOVERNMENT—DEATH OF H.R.H. THE DUKE OF GLOUCESTER — H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CUMBERLAND'S OPINIONS ON THE STATE OF AFFAIRS—CONSTRUCTION OF SIR ROBERT PEEL'S ADMINISTRATION—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HIS POLICY—OPPOSITION OF WHIGS AND RADICALS.

CHAPTER VI.

No portion of the Whig machinery of Government had become so obnoxious to the censure of honest politicians as their Commissions of Inquiry; for they were made to work in a particular groove, to secure a desired result. This was so conspicuously the case in the commission on the existing poor laws, that it excited very indignant comments from persons who had opportunities of observing the progress of the inquiry.

Each Commissioner had been sent into particular counties with instructions to obtain evidence of the working of the poor laws in those portions of the kingdom. They made individual reports of what they had seen and heard, and obtained evidence of the subject; and from all the reports and all the evidence, a general report was drawn up, from which it has been confidently stated, "there is too good reason to believe that all which told strongly in favour of the old Elizabethan law was omitted, whilst all which militated against its policy was retained."[1]

[1] Doubleday. "Political Life of Sir Robert Peel," ii. 184. This writer adds, "That the report and evidence upon which the Poor Law Amendment Act was based, were garbled, the author asserts from

The measure framed on such information was necessarily objectionable in almost every deviation from the existing laws, and its provisions have been declaimed against, as bearing with cruel severity against unavoidable misfortune. The new arrangements gave employment to the supporters of the Government, but this was a recommendation not universally appreciated. The unconstitutional character of their treatment of the poor became evident, and much increased the unpopularity of the Whigs among the humbler classes.

On the 10th of November, Earl Spencer died at his seat, Althorp Park, at the age of seventy-six; he had been First Lord of the Admiralty during Mr. Pitt's Administration, from 1794 to 1801, a period of extraordinary interest in our naval history, as it included the great victories of Camperdown, Cape St. Vincent, and the Nile. He had previously been for a short time Lord Privy Seal, and had been sent on a special embassy to the Court of Vienna. Lord Spencer was Secretary of State for the Home Department in Lord Grenville's Administration, but would not accept office afterwards.

direct personal knowledge. The evidence collected in the two northern counties of Durham and Northumberland was highly favourable to the old law, which in these districts was honestly and liberally worked, and with which no one worth mentioning was dissatisfied. The whole of the Commissioners' Report, with the evidence, save and except a few sentences, amounting to only a paragraph or two of no consequence, was accordingly *suppressed;* so that these two counties were all but ignored, together with their population, their extensive commerce, and vast mining establishments, in the document upon which Parliament proceeded to legislate on this occasion."

Earl Spencer was as intimately connected with literature as with politics; indeed, after his retirement from the cares of office, his life was almost entirely devoted to forwarding the interests of science and learning. He was elected President of the Royal Institution on the death of the Earl of Winchelsea, and collected one of the finest private libraries in Europe.[1] He also became President of the Roxburgh Club, in the year 1812, for which, in 1816, he reprinted Churchyard's Translation of "Ovid de Tristibus;" and in the year 1825, "La Rotta de Scocesi." In literary society he was much and deservedly esteemed, and at his hospitable board had entertained the most distinguished men of his time. In brief, he was generally popular.

Earl Spencer's death took Lord Althorp from the House of Commons, and four days afterwards Lord Melbourne waited on the King at Brighton to receive his Majesty's commands respecting the appointment of a new Chancellor of the Exchequer. On the Premier intimating that Lord John Russell was to be leader in the House of Commons, the King is reported to have spoken out in language for which his Prime Minister seemed quite unprepared.

His Majesty said that he considered the Government dissolved by the removal of Lord Althorp to the House of Lords, and that he did not approve of the proposed reconstruction of the Cabinet. The King, moreover, stated that Lord Brougham could

[1] See Dr. Dibdin's "Ædes Althorpianæ."

not continue to be Lord Chancellor, expressed his dissatisfaction with the Irish Church Bill, and with every one who had assisted in framing it. His Majesty then informed Lord Melbourne that he would save him the trouble of completing his arrangements, and gave him a letter to take to the Duke of Wellington, whom he expressed his intention to consult. Lord Melbourne took the proffered communication and his departure, apparently very much astonished at the result of his interview, and having represented the state of the case to his colleagues, a general resignation became a matter of course.[1] These his Majesty graciously accepted.

The Duke of Wellington waited on the King the following day, and suggested to his Majesty to send for Sir Robert Peel, who was on his road to Italy, and place him at the head of the Administration. A courier was therefore immediately despatched after Sir Robert, and although all arrangements were deferred till his return, the announcement in the *Gazette* of the 18th, of the Duke of Wellington as one of the principal Secretaries of State, proved that his powerful assistance was to be given to the new Government.

The news created quite as much excitement among the political friends of the Duke, as it did among their opponents. The following is one of the communications that express the surprise of the Conservative leaders.

[1] "Annual Register."

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Wynyard Park, Nov. 18, 1834.

My dear Duke,

On my return from the province of Ulster, where there really exists a fine spirit, and where we can do a great deal, I was met by the astounding intelligence that H.M. has thought fit at the eleventh hour to try a stand-up fight with the Whigs!

I confess I have seen so much weakness in a certain quarter, that I hardly can believe the decision will be of long duration. But I know nothing, how brought about, or what is thought or expected. It is clear that * * * * * * * will not let go his hold, if he can by any intrigue or management retain it.

Will H.M. be able to resist all his attempts, and not fall back to the Reformers. To speculate, I should say that the K. has hardly taken this step without Taylor having felt his way to see if Stanley would act with and under Peel; and my impression is, we shall have this section of the Reformers coalescing with the Duke's former Government and the ultra Tories, uniting all under the name of Conservatives. If the Duke of W. has the cards to deal, he will have more difficulty from the old claims of his old officials than a new man. I hope, however, whoever it is, that they will not act upon the fallacious plan of buying off deserters. Let them come, well and good. But beware of putting them over the heads of those who have fought the campaign.

I should not think it unlikely, in Peel's absence, that the Speaker would be sent to. But I think it equally certain that nothing can be done or settled until he arrives from abroad. Far removed as I am here in comparison

to you, pray give me a line as to your cogitations, and what you hear or learn.

I would have written to you from Ireland, but I could tell you little more than the papers. Littleton's episode to our town meeting was rather curious. He and his friends wished me to be more explicit, and I was so, and they are perfectly satisfied, and so am I.

I shall not stir from home again until after Christmas; so pray, my dear Duke, write what occurs, and

Believe me ever,

Yours most sincerely,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

We now give, under the hand of the Duke of Wellington, in his own simple, clear, and expressive language, a report of the true cause of the dissolution of the Whig Government, and of the part the Duke had been persuaded to take towards the formation of a Conservative Administration. The conduct of this distinguished man was evidently worthy of his fame. The transaction shows the confidence with which he was regarded by the King; his Majesty's dissatisfaction with the proceedings of his late counsellors, and the Duke's disinterestedness and loyalty in accepting a subordinate place when his Sovereign demanded his services, in preference to taking the highest and most desirable post.

The Duke's sense of duty, which, throughout his honourable career, was in him as powerful as his religious faith, influenced all his proceedings at this

juncture; equally remarkable, however, is the sound policy of the course he adopted.

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

London, Nov. 21, 1834.

My dear Duke,

I am anxious that you should have a knowledge of the circumstances which have led to the late changes in H.M.'s Government, of its present state, and of the part which I have taken in what has occurred.

The death of the late Earl Spencer, which removed Lord Althorp from the House of Commons, from the management of the Government business in that assembly, and from the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, occasioned the greatest difficulty and embarrassment. His personal influence and weight in the House of Commons, was the main foundation of the strength of the late Government, and upon his removal it was necessary for the King and his Ministers to consider whether fresh arrangements should be made to enable H.M.'s late servants to conduct the affairs of the country, or whether it was advisable for his Majesty to adopt any other course.

The arrangements in contemplation must have had reference, not only to men, but to measures. The King felt the strongest objections to some of the latter, of the details of which H.M. had been informed by conversation with his Ministers, particularly to some relating to the Church of England in Ireland.

H.M. had besides had reason to believe that he did not object more strongly to the measures in contemplation, than [to] certain of the noblemen and gentlemen

composing the Cabinet. He had reason to expect, therefore, that the measures proposed which were to enable his Ministers to conduct his affairs, would have had the effect of inducing those members of the Government to retire, probably at a more critical moment than exists at present.

The King might likewise have been exposed to the necessity of taking into his councils men to whom neither H.M. nor the public could give their confidence. Under these circumstances, the King thought proper to send for me, and to desire me to form a Government for him.

I pointed out to H.M. the great difficulties of the task, particularly in the House of Commons, resulting from the late changes, and I earnestly recommended that H.M. should choose a Minister in the House of Commons, and that Sir Robert Peel should be the person.

The King would have adopted that course if Sir Robert Peel had been in England, but H.M. said that as he was absent, and it was necessary to act immediately, he had sent for me.

I submitted to H.M. that I was ready to do anything for his service; that it was unreasonable to expect that Sir Robert Peel would undertake to conduct the measures of an Administration, of which the arrangements should have been formed by another person; and that such a course would be equally injurious to Sir Robert and to H.M.'s service; that, under these circumstances, I recommended to H.M. that he should appoint me First Lord of the Treasury, and Secretary of State for the Home Department, which offices I would hold till Sir Robert Peel should return home, when he might submit to H.M. such arrangements as he might think proper;

that Lord Lyndhurst might hold the Great Seal temporarily, by commission or otherwise, as might be expedient; and that no other arrangement should be made not absolutely necessary for the conduct of the public business.

H.M. was pleased to attend to my recommendation. Sir Robert Peel has been sent for, and may be expected in the end of the first week of December, and at that period, I conclude that he will form the arrangements necessary for the conduct of the affairs of the country.

Believe me ever yours most sincerely,

WELLINGTON.

His Grace the Duke of Buckingham, &c., K.G.

On the 21st of the month, Lord Lyndhurst was gazetted as Lord Chancellor; the office he held—Chief Baron of the Exchequer—he did not immediately resign, and Lord Brougham offered to fill it without salary, expressing himself content with his pension as a retired Lord Chancellor.

In the height of the excitement caused by these changes, his Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester died at Bagshot Park, on the 30th, at the age of fifty-eight. The Duke's amiability had endeared him to a large circle, by whom he was deeply and sincerely lamented.

We now publish another report of recent political proceedings, from a well-informed source, with additional particulars, which will not be read without interest. The writer's comments on the conduct of the Duke of Wellington were warranted by the

facts, and stand out in striking contrast with the conduct of a great Whig reform leader as soon as his party had settled themselves into place and power. The difficulties of the position he seems also to have been well aware of, and gives very sound advice.

H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CUMBERLAND TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Berlin, Dec. 5, 1834.

DEAR DUKE,

Having so completely agreed in your political views of late, and trusting that the present crisis may produce indisputable good, I think it *due* to you to give you my opinion of things. Many, yes, I may say everybody, has been taken by surprise at the breaking up of the Melbourne Government at *this* moment. I for *one* did state ere I left England, that I felt convinced in my mind that Melbourne would never meet Parliament as the Minister of this country, and I told him this myself at the last levee, the 20th August; for I felt certain that previous to the meeting of Parliament, when the Cabinet reassembled to consider what should be the measures to be brought forward during the session, that they would split upon that. Now you, dear Duke, must acknowledge that my speculation was a fair one. I certainly did not at the time reflect on the probability of Lord Spencer's death, though the possibility had presented itself to my mind.

One *thing* is perfectly clear, that if the Conservatives were surprised at the breaking up of the late Government, *they* themselves were *not less* so; and, in fact, on the 14th they felt certain that H. M. would sanction the pro-

posal which Lord M. had gone down to Brighton to propose; namely, that Lord John Russell was to succeed Lord Althorp as the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and consequently leader of the House of Commons; for precaution's sake, however, *two* other names were carried down, which I believe were Spring Rice—whether Mr. Littleton or Abercrombie was the third, I cannot precisely make out.

Upon this, H.M. is said to have inquired into the state of the parties in the Cabinet, and as to *what* proposals they meant to lay before Parliament respecting the Irish Church and the corporate bodies; the reply was of a nature that alarmed him, and he instantly resolved to get rid of such dangerous Ministers.

The appearance of the D. of W. at the Pavilion was a complete surprise to all the inmates, as not a living soul there had had the slightest idea of *his* having been sent for. I think that the conduct of the Duke upon the present occasion is one of the most noble, disinterested, and magnanimous in the annals of politics, and must and ought to give confidence to the country in the purity of his intentions. And I equally think we are *one* and *all* bound to put our shoulders to the wheel and aid him with all our might; and if we act *thus*, and do not permit ourselves to be *led astray* by *selfish views and opinions*, or allow *petty* jealousies to take root among us, we must succeed, though I dissemble not to myself that we must have a frightful battle to fight; therefore I do implore *all* my friends not to fail me, but to be in their posts when Parliament meets.

Whether a dissolution is to take place or not, I am not to decide; still I own I have doubts on my mind, if it would not be more prudent perhaps just to try *this*,

as I am led to believe there are many who know their present seats must cease at a dissolution, and therefore, having that hanging over them, would support this Government. The scheme is at least worth trying, and if it is proved that they are refractory, then dissolve without an hour's notice.

Before the 7th or 8th I reckon it impossible that Peel can arrive in England. So far, there is no denying that the moment is propitious for us, as Parliament is not sitting, and therefore there is ample time to make a deliberate and cool choice, not only as to persons, but equally as to measures. Lyndhurst having accepted the *seals* I think a prodigious point, and he will impress courage on any party. I wrote to the Duke of W. as soon as I learnt the change, and expect in a few days to hear from him, which naturally cannot well be till he has seen Peel. If I am wanted, I can come at a moment's warning; but for certain shall be in town for the meeting of Parliament.

Wishing and hoping that nothing may prevent your being *there* also, believe me,

Dear Duke,

Yours very faithfully,

ERNEST.

The speculations that are made in the next communication respecting a section of the Whigs were not without foundation; and as their inclination for office was suspected, Sir Robert Peel soon after his arrival in London on the 7th of December, made proposals to Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham to join his Administration. There was

much deliberation on the subject, but as neither would pledge himself to forward Conservative measures to the extent required, Sir Robert was obliged to form a Government exclusively from his own political friends.

RIGHT HON. C. W. W. WYNN TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Llangedwin, 6th Dec., 1834.

My dear B.,

The plot seems to thicken. I hear that Stanley, Graham, and the D. of Richmond have had a meeting at the D. of Sutherland's, to determine their future course.

How comes the King to be so very gracious to Westminster school, and so ungracious to his defunct brother-in-law, that when, in pursuance of ancient etiquette, the annual play was put an end to, in consequence of the D. of Gloucester's death, he notified his pleasure that it should proceed, and that he would himself be a spectator, which he never has been before; and, therefore, I suppose having nothing else to do, means to pass the interval between this and the 16th in brushing up his Latin and studying Terence.

I should guess by the account of Peel's voyages, that he may reach London on Monday night or Tuesday morning. He first must see the K., and then send for Stanley to town; and till their interview is over, he cannot attempt to settle anything.

Ever affectionately yours,

C. W. W. W.

On the 10th of the month the arrangements were completed, and the new Conservative Government was thus formed:—

CABINET.

Sir Robert Peel	*First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer.*
Duke of Wellington	*Foreign Secretary.*
Right Honourable Henry Goulburn	*Home Secretary.*
Earl of Aberdeen	*Colonial Secretary.*
Right Hon. John Charles Herries	*Secretary at War.*
Lord Lyndhurst	*Lord Chancellor.*
Earl of Rosslyn	*President of the Council.*
Lord Wharncliffe	*Lord Privy Seal.*
Earl de Grey	*First Lord of the Admiralty.*
Sir Henry Hardinge	*Secretary for Ireland.*
Lord Ellenborough	*President of the Board of Control.*
Right Honourable Alexander Baring	*Master of the Mint and President of the Board of Trade.*
Sir Edward Knatchbull	*Paymaster of the Forces.*
Sir George Murray	*Master-General of the Ordnance.*

The other offices were thus filled:—

Lord Maryborough	*Postmaster-General.*
Earl of Jersey	*Lord Chamberlain.*
Earl of Wilton	*Lord Steward.*
Duke of Dorset	*Master of the Horse.*
Marquis of Winchester	*Groom of the Stole.*
Viscount Lowther	*Vice-President of the Board of Trade, and Treasurer of the Navy.*
Lord Granville Somerset	*First Commissioner of Land Revenues.*
Right Honourable C. W. W. Wynn	*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.*
Sir F. Pollock	*Attorney-General.*
William Webb Follet	*Solicitor-General.*
Earl of Haddington	*Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.*
Sir Edward Sugden	*Lord Chancellor of Ireland.*
Sir H. H. Vivian	*Commander of the Forces.*
Serjeant Edward Pennefather	*Attorney-General.*
Mr. Devonshire Jackson	*Solicitor-General.*

It was not possible to have organized at the time a Government out of better materials, if talent and

principle are essential to its construction. The same attention is evident in the selection of subordinates. On the 24th, the Commissioners of the Treasury were announced; they were, Sir Robert Peel, William Yates Peel, Viscount Stormont, Mr. Charles Ross, and Mr. W. E. Gladstone. The Right Hon. J. Sullivan, Sir A. C. Grant, and Mr. Planta were appointed Commissioners for the Affairs of India. The Secretaries were, for the Treasury, Sir G. Clerk, Bart., Sir T. F. Fremantle, Bart.; for the Admiralty, Right Hon. G. R. Dawson; for the Board of Control, W. M. Praed, Esq.. The Under Secretaries were, for the Home Department, Lord Elliot; for Foreign Affairs, Viscount Mahon; for the Colonies, Hon. T. S. Wortley. The Right Hon. Sir J. Beckett was selected to be Judge-Advocate-General, and Sir W. Ray, Lord Advocate of Scotland. In the Queen's household, Earl Howe was appointed Lord Chamberlain, and the Earl of Errol, Master of the Horse.

On the 23rd, the Solicitor-General was knighted; and the Attorney-General on the 29th. On the 29th, the Earl of Chesterfield and Philip Earl de Grey were sworn of the Privy Council. Viscount Castlereagh was appointed Vice-Chamberlain of his Majesty's Household. Viscount Hereford, Captain of his Majesty's Corps of Gentlemen-at-Arms; and the Hon. Henry Lowry Corry, Comptroller of his Majesty's Household. On the 30th, the Earl of Chesterfield was appointed Master of the King's

Buckhounds, and Lord Ernest Bruce and Lord Tullamore, Lords of his Majesty's Bedchamber.

Sir Robert Peel omitted nothing that could assure the nation his Government should be one that would never lose sight of the real interests of the country. The Reform Bill had become the law of the land, and however one-sided in its influence, no attempt would be made to alter any of its provisions. On the 18th, he published an address to the electors of Tamworth, which was a declaration to the country of his future policy. His intentions, as there clearly defined, were, to maintain the Reform Bill as a final settlement; to correct proved abuses and real grievances; to preserve the peace of the kingdom, and as far as was possible, of Europe; to resist the secularization of Church property; to fulfil existing engagements with foreign Powers, and to maintain a strict economy in the expenditure of the State, and a just and impartial consideration of what was due to every interest—agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial.

Here was the exposition of the policy of a great statesman; there was no attempt to support a party by setting one interest against another; and no intention of overlooking the claims to consideration of any section of the community, because a larger section might regard them with hostility. But wise and liberal as were these intimations, they failed to reconcile the Whigs to their loss of place, or the Radicals to their loss of power; and every attempt

was made by both to defeat the objects of Sir Robert Peel, and bring himself and his Government into contempt and detestation.

The first public manifestation of this spirit appeared when a public meeting of the City bankers and merchants was called, at the City of London Tavern, on the 23rd of December, to vote an address to the King, expressing approval of his Majesty's dismissal of his Ministers, when a tumultuous assemblage of Radicals intruded into the room, and prevented the meeting passing any resolution. Nevertheless, the Premier was warmly supported by the mercantile classes, and at a dinner given by the Lord Mayor, at the Mansion House, had an opportunity of stating his views, which were favourably received.

On the 30th, the first reformed Parliament was dissolved by proclamation, after a brief existence of one year and eleven months. About the same time appeared an address to the King in support of the new Ministry, signed by the merchants, bankers, shipowners, and other persons of influence in the City of London, to the number of 5730, the publication of which in the *Times* journal cost 240 guineas.[1]

The Opposition got up an "anti-Tory association," and held frequent public meetings, at which buried scandals were revived, and old abuses poured out with new energy.

[1] Wade's "British Chronology," 961.

The re-union of the divided Whigs and Liberals was at once regarded as a vital necessity, and a new compact was entered into that promised much for the latter, provided the former were re-installed in their old position. Both parties evidently began to work with a will. Seeing nothing in the recal of the Conservatives to power but their own future impotence, if not annihilation, their first energies were directed against the Court, striving to produce an impression in the public mind that the change of Government had been the result of a back-stairs intrigue, which their Majesties had countenanced.

"Men high in office," says one authority, "had in the bitterness of their mortification and passion, not hesitated to implicate the Queen by name, as the leader of the irresponsible advisers of a violent course; and the Whigs everywhere asserted that the real object of this change was the gradual repeal of the Reform Act, and the quasi-restoration of the close-borough system, by means of the gradual narrowing of the franchise."[1]

The fallacious character of the great political panacea had not yet had time to display itself; nor had the old enthusiasm for it completely subsided. "Reform in danger!" therefore became the popular shibboleth, varied occasionally with denunciations against a Government of boroughmongers. The dissolution of the reformed Parliament was regarded

[1] Doubleday. "Political Life of Sir Robert Peel," ii. 196.

as a political sacrilege; a manifest flying in the face of the people; a clear declaration of an intention to destroy popular rights; and during the general election, every effort was made from the hustings to influence public opinion by statements and representations respecting Tory abuses, such as had been found effectual in returning the large majority of Whigs and Radicals in the last Parliament.

Sir Robert Peel was perfectly aware of the difficulties of his position; he knew he was entering upon an unequal contest; but supported as he was by the bulk of the intelligence and property of the country, continued his course with the determination of showing that he was not to be intimidated by clamour, nor driven from his post by mendacity.

CHAPTER VII.

[1835.]

SIR ROBERT PEEL AND LORD ELDON—RESULT OF THE ELECTIONS—THE WHIGS AND RADICALS ELECT A NEW SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—THE KING'S SPEECH—DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS—SCENES IN PARLIAMENT—MOTION FOR THE REPEAL OF THE MALT TAX—POLITICAL INCUBATION—DEMONSTRATION OF THE REFORMERS—MAJORITY AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT—RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS—LIBERAL ENCOURAGEMENT AFFORDED BY THE LATE GOVERNMENT TO LITERATURE AND SCIENCE—THE NEW WHIG CABINET—THEIR DIFFICULTIES—INFAMOUS PLACARD—MOTION FOR THE REDUCTION OF TAXATION—VOTE BY BALLOT—CIVIL WAR IN SPAIN.

CHAPTER VII.

THERE was a section in the Conservative party, noticed more than once in these volumes, whose support the new Government thought it advisable to endeavour to secure; and principally with this object, Sir Robert Peel wrote on the first day of the new year to one of its most influential members, Lord Eldon.

"Your long experience in public life," he observed, "and devotion to your public duties, will, I hope, have found an excuse for me, if, under the circumstances under which I was called to England, and the incessant and most harassing occupation in which I have been since engaged both day and night, I have appeared deficient through my silence in that respect which I most sincerely entertain for you; and which, but for the circumstances to which I have referred, ought to have, and would have, dictated a much earlier communication to you on the subject of the position of public affairs, and the course which I proposed as the King's Minister to pursue.

"The course has now been sufficiently indicated

by the public declarations which I have been called upon to make, and by the appointments which have taken place on my advice to the chief offices of the King's Government. It only remains, therefore, to apologize to you for a seeming inadvertence and inattention which would be wholly at variance with my real feelings, and to express an earnest hope that the Administration over which I preside will entitle itself by its acts to your support and confidence."

In the *Gazette* of the 3rd of February the appointment of a Commission was announced to inquire into the state of the several dioceses of England and Wales—the Commissioners being the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Lyndhurst, the Archbishop of York, the Earl of Harrowby, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Gloucester, Sir Robert Peel, the Right Hon. Henry Goulburn, the Right Hon. Charles Watkin Williams Wynn, the Right Hon. Henry Hobhouse, and the Right Hon. Sir Herbert Jenner.

There was a practical character about this announcement that took many persons by surprise; and it was the first of a series of similar effects they were to experience.

In the course of the same month, the arrangements for the royal household were completed. The Earl of Courtown was appointed Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard; and the Earls of Verulam, Sheffield, and Morton, Viscount Sydney, and Lord

de Lisle, Lords of the Bedchamber. The Right Hon. W. Baron Fitzgerald and Vesey was created a Baron of the United Kingdom; also Sir James Scarlett Baron Abinger; Sir Philip Charles Sidney Baron de l'Isle and Dudley; and George Charles Pratt, Earl of Brecknock, Baron Camden. In the subsequent month, the Earl of Wilton, Viscount Castlereagh, and the Right Hon. H. T. L. Corry were sworn of the Privy Council.

One hundred and forty new members had been returned for England, sixteen for Scotland, and twenty-eight for Ireland, the Whigs and Radicals in the boroughs and counties losing a hundred seats. The Opposition had not been idle previously to and subsequently to the elections, and determined on a course of active hostility to the Government in both Houses of Parliament. Of their numerical majority in the Lower House, when Whigs and Radicals combined, they were certain; and of this they would avail themselves on the first opportunity to turn out the Ministry; while they employed every means at their disposal to keep up a clamour against them out of doors as the enemies of reform and supporters of every abuse; nevertheless, the important towns of Bristol, Exeter, Newcastle, Hull, Warrington, Halifax, York, and Leeds had preferred a Conservative to a Whig.

The opportunity that was sought presented itself when the House of Commons assembled to appoint their Speaker.

Temporary accommodation was made for both Houses of the Legislature; for the Commons on the site of the House of Lords; for the Peers in the Painted Chamber. The former having assembled, Lord Francis Egerton having proposed the re-election of Sir Charles Manners Sutton, Mr. Denison, on the part of the Opposition, proposed Mr. James Abercromby. Their claims to the distinction were these: the former had for eighteen years filled the office with not less dignity than ability, and his re-election would lessen the public burthens by the amount of his retiring pension; the latter was chiefly known to his party as a consistent Whig, and that was his sole recommendation to them.

His supporters had circulated many foolish reports and groundless accusations against their late Speaker; but in the course of the debate he rose and gave them a clear denial. Notwithstanding his experience and ability, and the high character given him by Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, and other distinguished members, the advantage of getting rid of him in favour of Mr. Abercromby was insisted on by Lord John Russell; and the Whigs and Radicals, to show their impartiality, voted for him; and to prove their love of economy, supported the candidate who would cost the country the most money.

In the division, with the assistance of the Repealers, they managed to secure a majority of ten,

the result of which was, that an efficient public servant retired into private life, and the nation was saddled with the unnecessary expense of his retiring pension. On the 28th of the month, he was raised to the peerage as Viscount Canterbury. The Opposition, however, had the satisfaction of stating that they were influenced by an "imperious sense of public duty."

The King opened Parliament in person on the 24th of February with a speech of considerable length and of unusual interest. After referring to the recent destruction of the two Houses by fire, his Majesty noticed an exception to the peace of Europe in the civil contest then raging in the northern provinces of Spain; and expressed his regret that the relations between Holland and Belgium were still unsettled. The King then informed the House of Commons that the estimates for the current year had been framed with such a real regard for economy that the total amount required for the public service would be less than had been demanded "on any former occasion within recent experience."[1] An announcement that must have been peculiarly gratifying to those economists who had already succeeded in adding 5000*l.* a-year to the public burdens.

His Majesty then expressed an opinion that the satisfactory state of the trade and commerce of the country and of the public revenue justified the ex-

[1] Hansard.

pectation that, notwithstanding recent reductions in taxation, which must diminish the public revenue, there would be a sufficient balance to meet the additional charge of compensation on account of the abolition of slavery throughout the British dominions

The King having lamented the existing depression of the agricultural interest, suggested a mitigation of the pressure of those local charges that pressed heavily on the owners and occupiers of land, and a distribution of such burdens more equally over other descriptions of property. His Majesty next referred to the satisfactory working in the colonies of the law for the abolition of slavery, and stated that measures were in preparation for the commutation of tithes in England and Wales; for the improvement of civil jurisprudence, and the administration of justice in ecclesiastical causes; for making provision for the more effectual maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline, and for the relief of those who dissent from the doctrines or discipline of the Church, from the necessity of celebrating the ceremony of marriage according to its rites.

These promises of substantial reforms ought to have been satisfactory to the entire country, but were eminently the reverse to persons who fancied they had an exclusive right to produce such measures. They regarded the announcement as an attempt to take the bread out of their mouths, to

deprive them of their vocation, to cut the ground from under their feet. Their opposition, therefore, was a matter of course.

Two of the remaining paragraphs of the speech were devoted to the Commissioners' reports, and related principally to the appointment of a Commission for considering the state of the several dioceses in England and Wales, with reference to the amount of their revenues, and for the more equal distribution of the episcopal duties; the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as might render them more conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church; and for devising the best mode of providing for the cure of souls, with reference to the residence of the clergy on their respective benefices. The especial object of this Commission was to extend more widely the means of religious worship according to the doctrines of the Established Church, and to confirm its hold upon the veneration and affections of the people.

In conclusion, his Majesty stated that he relied with entire confidence on the willing co-operation of both Houses of Parliament in perfecting all measures calculated to remove just cause of complaint, and to promote the comfort and happiness of his subjects; and felt an equal reliance on their exercising caution and circumspection in the alteration of laws which affect very extensive and complicated

interests, and were interwoven with ancient usages, to which the habits and feelings of his people have conformed.

On the 24th, a debate arose in the House of Lords on moving the address, when Lord Melbourne attacked both the King's speech and the King's Government—the former for being defective in many points, the latter apparently for not being Whig. He is reported to have said that he looked upon the late dissolution of Parliament as a wanton exercise of power, and regarded the speech as wholly inconsistent with the political character, principles, and professions of those by whom it had been advised. He concluded by moving an amendment, the principal feature in which was a declaration of the House to an adherence of the policy of the late Government.

The Duke of Wellington, who had been named in the preceding speech as the Minister responsible for the recent changes, rose, and acknowledged his responsibility, but stated the fact that the dismissal of the previous Ministry had been caused by the leader of the House of Commons having ceased to be a member of that branch of the Legislature. Lord Brougham seconded the amendment, which was opposed by the Lord Chancellor; and after a few words from the Duke of Richmond and other peers, it was put, and negatived without a division.

In the House of Commons, an amendment was

proposed by Lord Morpeth, stating that his Majesty's faithful Commons could not but lament that the progress of reform should have been interrupted and endangered by the dissolution of a Parliament earnestly intent upon the vigorous prosecution of measures to which the wishes of the people were most anxiously and justly directed. A debate of two nights' duration followed, the principal orators being Sir Robert Peel and Lord Stanley; but the speakers were numerous. Sir Robert was more than usually eloquent in his vindication of the prerogative of the Crown and of the measures of his Administration.

He analysed the components of the Opposition with singular skill, and reproduced with a most amusing effect the opinions on different members of the Whig Government which Mr. O'Connell, their present champion, had only a few months before expressed. He exposed their political shortcomings with the same felicity, and showed how often he had been obliged to come to their assistance from the attacks of their Radical friends. He took upon himself the responsibility of the dissolution, and showed that no important change in the Government had ever taken place without an appeal to the people. He then explained the policy he intended to pursue, and recommended the House to wait until it should have an opportunity of considering the measures he was about to propose.

But that was what the leading members of the Opposition had determined not to do. The measures were important, and promised to be popular, but the framers of them must be got rid of before they could establish themselves in their position by such powerful appeals to public favour.

The debate, therefore, was pressed to a division, and again, with the assistance of the Irish members, it gave the opponents of Ministers the small majority of seven; an unsatisfactory result to the Opposition, it being too insignificant to carry much weight as an expression of public opinion, and showing a diminution of strength from the party majority obtained on the choice of Speaker.

If this pleased them little, the King's message in reply to the amended address pleased them still less. His Majesty sent the following gracious answer: "I thank you sincerely for the assurances which you have given me, in this loyal and dutiful address, of your disposition to co-operate with me in the improvement, with a view to the maintenance, of our institutions in Church and State. I learn with regret that you do not concur with me as to the policy of the appeal which I have recently made to the sense of my people. I never have exercised, and I never will exercise, any of the prerogatives which I hold, excepting for the single purpose of promoting the great end for which they are entrusted to me—the public good; and I confidently trust that no measure conducive to the general

interests will be endangered or interrupted in its progress by the opportunity which I have afforded to my faithful and loyal subjects of expressing their opinions through the choice of their representatives in Parliament."

Little consolation was to be found in this—the Opposition leaders could not digest their disappointment; and when Sir Robert Peel moved for a Committee of Supply, Lord John Russell rose to call the attention of the House to the *extraordinary* situation of the present Ministry, after the recent defeats they had sustained; but Sir Robert, in reply, stated his determination to persevere in doing his duty. This emphatic call on the attention of the House had a similar result to that of Owen Glendower to "the spirits of the vasty deep."

The Opposition leader had too much at stake to be discomfited, and in council with his coadjutors, strove to find some plan by which the object they had in view might be accomplished. Unfortunately for his Administration, the Minister a few days later took a part in a great public question that much lessened his popularity in the agricultural districts. On the 10th of March, a motion for a repeal of the malt-tax was brought forward as a measure well calculated to relieve the overwhelming distress of the agricultural interest. Mr. Handley seconded it.

Sir Robert Peel opposed it as premature, as

being too large a source of revenue to be dispensed with in a deficient exchequer, and as making imperative the substitution of an income-tax, which he appeared to deprecate, absolutely cautioning the House "against exchanging the light pressure of a malt duty for the *scourge* of a property-tax."

An animated debate ensued, in which many members of the Opposition supported the views of the Minister, Mr. Hume alone appearing favourable to the motion. On the division, many members who had given pledges at the hustings to support such a motion, voted against it, and the result was, it was lost by 350 to 192.

On the 17th, Sir Robert Peel moved for leave to bring in a Bill to alter the law of marriages as regarded Dissenters. It was favourably received, and agreed to. On the 20th, Sir Henry Hardinge brought forward the Government measure for the commutation of tithes in Ireland; on which there seemed to be a difference of opinion in the House; Lord John Russell contending that it was identical in principle with the Bill proposed by the late Ministers, which had been thrown out by the friends of the present Government; Mr. O'Connell contending that the two measures were dissimilar. Mr. Rice moved an amendment that was negatived by a majority of fifteen.

The House, however, showed a decidedly unpleasant temper on the 23rd, when one of the Irish

members so coarsely attacked the members of the Government, that, on being called to order by the Speaker, he found it necessary to apologize. Sir Robert Peel made a powerful appeal to the good sense of the assembly, and defended himself and his colleagues from the charges that had been brought against them. It was in reference to this scene that Lord Eldon wrote to his daughter describing the House of Commons as having become "more like a bear-garden than a meeting of gentlemen."[1] He, however, was not quite satisfied with the proceedings of the Government.

"I hear," he writes, "that the Church Commissioners have made one report, but I have not yet been able to see it. The new Ministers certainly have the credit, if that be creditable, of being inclined to get as much popularity by what are called reforms, as their predecessors; and if they do not at present go to the full length to which the others were going, they will, at least, make so many important changes in Church and State, that nobody can guess how far the precedents they establish may lead to changes of a very formidable kind hereafter."

It was this adoption of reform measures on the part of Sir Robert Peel's Administration which elicited from Mr. Hume the opinion that Ministers had crept into the nest of their predecessors, and

[1] Twiss. "Life," ii. 342.

were hatching their eggs. Such incubations, however, became every day more repugnant to the feelings of those who fancied themselves the proprietors both of the nest and the eggs.

On the 24th, Sir Robert Peel brought under the consideration of the House his measure relating to tithes in England and Wales. During the debate that ensued, very little hostility was exhibited, and a resolution embodying the principles of the proposed Bill was agreed to. The Opposition, however, were preparing for a grand demonstration, preliminary to which, as was usual with them, they got up public meetings to express their opinions. The most important took the shape of a dinner given to Lord John Russell, at the Freemasons' Tavern, on the 28th, when nearly three hundred members of Parliament assembled, and many suggestive speeches were delivered by Lords John Russell, Morpeth, Dalmeney, and Ebrington; the Earl of Kerry, Mr. Grote, and Mr. Fox Maule.

The threatened demonstration was made on the 30th, when Lord John Russell brought forward a resolution for applying the surplus revenues of the Church of Ireland to secular purposes, in this form —"That the House do resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House to consider the temporalities of the Church of Ireland, with the view of applying any surplus of its revenue not required for the general purposes of the Church to the

general, moral, and religious instruction of his Majesty's subjects in Ireland, without reference to their religious distinctions."

He knew he should not only secure the support of the Irish Catholics and the English Dissenters in this attack on the Church of England, but hoped to obtain the votes of independent members who could see no harm in considering its temporalities; for the resolution did not go beyond this ostensibly. But it not only went much beyond it in reality, it was quite as real an attack on the Government as on the Church; for the Administration stood pledged to support these temporalities, and were not likely to abandon them.

Ministers were well aware of the object of the motion, and the leading Conservative members, during a debate that was prolonged for four nights, made every exertion to maintain their position. If argument could have done it, they must have succeeded; for among the speakers on their side were, Sir Edward Knatchbull, Sir James Graham, Sir Robert Inglis, Lord Stanley, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, Sir William Follett, Mr. Praed, and Mr. Goulburn.

Towards the close of the debate, Sir Robert Peel declared his decided hostility to the appropriation of Church revenues to any but ecclesiastical purposes, and stated his readiness to remedy any proved abuses in the Irish Church. He acknowledged that, should the efforts of the Opposition

prove successful, it would be impossible for him to retain the post he held. Of this his political opponents had been well aware, and the avowal made their combination more firm and their opposition more decided. The speakers on their side were of every political complexion, the most prominent being Irish repealers; and with their aid, Lord John Russell on the division secured a majority of 33.

This victory was not allowed to remain fruitless. On the 4th of April, Lord John brought forward a more decided resolution. "That it is the opinion of this Committee, that any surplus which may remain after fully providing for the spiritual wants of the members of the Established Church of Ireland, ought to be applied to the general education of all classes of Christians." This produced a two days' debate, and on the 6th there was a division in favour of the Opposition; the majority, however, reduced to 25.

Lord John, determined to make the most of his opportunity, on the 7th, when the report was brought up, moved, "That it is the opinion of this House that no measures upon the subject of tithes in Ireland can lead to a satisfactory and final adjustment, which does not embody the principle contained in the foregoing resolution." A third debate followed, which was maintained with unabated spirit; but though the Chancellor of the Exchequer resisted the motion, on the ground of its being

unprecedented and dangerous, this seemed a recommendation to its supporters, and a third victory ensued, the majority being 27.

On the following day, the Duke of Wellington in the House of Lords, and Sir Robert Peel in the Commons, announced their resignations, and the dissolution of the Conservative Administration. Both retired with dignity, and not without hope; indeed, the Opposition in the Lower House appeared charmed by the graceful valedictory address of the statesman they had succeeded in driving from his post. It not only elicited their hearty cheers, but the commendation of their acknowledged leader.

So ended the brief career of an Administration characterized by remarkable talent, by high principle, as well as an earnest desire to merit the public confidence, by bringing forward measures of practical utility and sound policy. The only false step they had made was their opposition to an attempt, recorded in a preceding page, to remove an oppressive duty, which lost them for a time the confidence of an influential section of their supporters, and excited the general suspicion that their promises to lessen the public burdens were not sincere.

Though their administrative intentions had been rendered nugatory, they did not surrender their places without conferring some benefits. The Whig Government, though putting forward excessive

claims to liberality, had been notoriously deficient in their support of science, art, and literature, except in such instances where the political partisan claimed a recompence, rather than the man of genius a competency. In a previous work we have noticed the benevolent and enlightened patronage of the Crown in the preceding reign in this direction. Sir Robert Peel took an early occasion to revive it. The claims of science were acknowledged by a pension of 300*l.* granted to Professor Airy, and one to Mrs. Somerville of 200*l.*; those of general literature, by one of 300*l.* to Dr. Southey; those of history, by one of 200*l.* to Sharon Turner; and those of poetry, by one of 150*l.* to James Montgomery.

The grants were as well deserved as they were wisely applied; and were an assurance that the labours of the mind in purely intellectual pursuits were not left entirely to find their commercial value, while ordinary ability in the service of the State enjoyed every facility for attaining wealth and honour.

These pensions did more service to the Conservative Government than the creation of offices to reward political supporters had done their predecessors; and the ability which the former had contrived to display during their short tenure of office, made a lasting impression upon the reflecting portion of the nation. By them the intelligence of their dissolution was received with regret; and

the opinion that they had not had fair play from their opponents, became as general as the conviction that their return to office could not be long prevented.

On the 18th of April, the formation of the new Government and of the Royal household was thus announced:—

CABINET.

Viscount Melbourne	*First Lord of the Treasury.*
Marquis of Lansdowne	*President of the Council.*
Viscount Palmerston	*Secretary for Foreign Affairs.*
Lord John Russell	*Secretary for the Home Department.*
Right Honourable Charles Grant	*Secretary for the Colonies.*
Lord Howick	*Secretary-at-War.*
Right Honourable Spring Rice	*Chancellor of the Exchequer.*
Viscount Duncannon	*Lord Privy Seal and Chief Commissioner of Woods and Forests.*
Lord Auckland	*First Lord of the Admiralty.*
Sir John Hobhouse	*President of the Board of Control.*
Right Honourable C. Poulett Thomson	*President of the Board of Trade.*
Lord Holland	*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.*

OTHER APPOINTMENTS.

Sir Henry Parnell	*Paymaster of the Forces and Treasurer of the Navy.*
Lord Morpeth	*Secretary for Ireland.*
Marquis of Conyngham	*Postmaster-General.*
Mr. Charles Wood	*Secretary to the Admiralty.*
Lord Dalmeny	*Junior Lords of the Admiralty.*
Admiral Sir E. T. Troubridge	
Admiral Sir W. Parker	
Captain the Honourable G. Elliott	
Lord Seymour	*Lords of the Treasury.*
Mr. W. H. Ord	
Mr. Robert Stewart	
Mr. T. Baring	*Secretaries of the Treasury.*
Mr. E. J. Stanley	
Mr. Robert Gordon	*Secretaries to the Board of Control.*
Mr. Vernon Smith	
Sir Rufane Donkin	*Surveyor-General of the Ordnance.*
Lieutenant-Colonel Fox	*Storekeeper-General.*
Earl of Mulgrave	*Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.*

Mr. H. Labouchere	*Vice-President of the Board of Trade and Master of the Mint.*
Sir George Grey	*Under-Secretary to the Colonies.*
Honourable Fox Maule	*Under-Secretary for the Home Department.*
Lord Fordwich	*Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs.*
Colonel Anson	*Store-Keeper of the Ordnance.*
Colonel Leith Haye	*Clerk to the Ordnance.*

ROYAL HOUSEHOLD.

Marquis Wellesley	*Lord Chamberlain.*
Lord Albert Conyngham	*Vice-Chamberlain.*
Duke of Argyll	*Lord Steward.*
Earl of Albemarle	*Master of the Horse.*
Earl of Erroll	*Master of the Buck Hounds.*
Earl of Gosford	*Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard.*

LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

Sir John Campbell	*Attorney-General.*
Mr. R. M. Rolfe	*Solicitor-General.*
Mr. Cutlar Ferguson	*Judge-Advocate.*
Mr. J. A. Murray	*Lord-Advocate for Scotland.*
Mr. Cunningham	*Solicitor-General for Scotland.*
Lord Plunkett	*Lord-Chancellor of Ireland.*
Serjeant Perrin	*Attorney-General for Ireland.*
Michael O'Loughlin	*Solicitor-General for Ireland.*

Lord Melbourne appointed Mr. Young, Lord John Russell Mr. Charles Gore, and Mr. Stanley Mr. George Arbuthnot, as their private secretaries.

The new Administration got into difficulties even at its birth. The appointment of a Lord Chancellor was the first. Lord Brougham was not desired, and the Government being unable to find a substitute, the Great Seal was put in commission. The second was the re-election of Lord John Russell, the late Opposition leader in the House of Commons, and the present Secretary of State for the Home Department. He stood for South

Devon, and was defeated by a Conservative candidate. Colonel Fox, however, retired from Stroud in his favour. A similar misfortune happened to Lord Palmerston, who lost his seat for Hampshire, but Mr. Kennedy in the same way made room for him at Tiverton.

Mr. Littleton, being raised to the peerage as Baron Hatherton by his political friends on the first opportunity, created a vacancy in Staffordshire, which a Conservative, despite of Government influence, was selected to fill; and Mr. Charles Grant, by the like means, becoming Baron Glenelg, left an opening in Inverness-shire, at which another Conservative entered Parliament. Indeed, so powerful a reaction in public feeling had set in in the counties, that Lord Morpeth found himself opposed for Yorkshire, and extraordinary exertions were obliged to be made to secure his return. The rest of the Ministry in the House of Commons contrived to secure their former seats.

These were extremely disagreeable facts, and appear to have put the Government, as well as its friends, in ill-humour; and the announcement of a public dinner at Merchant Tailors' Hall, at which the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, and other influential Conservatives, were to appear, created unusual excitement. On the morning before the banquet, a placard, containing the following words, was posted in conspicuous places of the City:—

"Poor men, take notice! A dinner to Peel will be

given by the rump of the Pitt and plunder faction, assisted by the self-elected and corrupt courts of assistants of the Grocers, Tailors, Goldsmiths, and Skinners; seven City aldermen, seven poverty-stricken peers, twenty-nine defeated candidates, three bishops, a bloated buffoon, the idiot, and a mayor, on Monday next, May 11th. The expenses to be defrayed out of the funds left for charitable purposes."[1]

This false and scandalous libel on the wealth and intelligence of the Metropolis did no harm. The dinner was attended by the principal merchants of London, and speeches of a strong Conservative character were received with universal applause. Sir Robert Peel addressed the meeting at considerable length, urging the necessity of exertion for the purpose of securing influence in the House of Commons; and his advice to register every vote that could be made available, was not thrown away.

The Whigs were far from comfortable when they beheld these testimonials in favour of their opponents, particularly with the consciousness that, as a party, they were completely dependent on a number of persons with whose known political principles they could have no feeling in common. This was so well understood, that when Lord Melbourne announced in the House of Lords that his arrangements for an Administration were complete, Lord Alvanley inquired if he had secured the

[1] *Annual Register.*

services of Mr. O'Connell and his friends, and desired to know, if he had succeeded, what had been the terms of the bargain.

Lord Brougham interposed with a protest against this inconvenient interrogatory; and Lord Melbourne professed ignorance of any negotiations with Mr. O'Connell. Nevertheless, the Government was in the hands of an Irish party; and though the Premier might repudiate any connexion with them, no observant politician could entertain a doubt that an understanding existed, by which both the Whigs and the Repealers hoped to be able to attain their several objects.

It was singular that scarcely had "the friends of the people" taken re-possession of their offices, than popular disturbances recommenced. As before, these began in the agricultural districts; but the working of the new poor law was now the exciting cause.

On the 21st of May, in the House of Peers, Lord Brougham, after a speech of considerable length, brought forward a series of resolutions relating to general education. On the 25th, in the other House, a member, after describing the sufferings existing in the agricultural districts, moved, "That an humble address be presented to his Majesty expressive of the deep regret which the House feels at the continuation of the distress experienced by the agricultural interest; and to express the anxious desire of the House that the attention of his Ma-

jesty's Government should be directed to the subject, with the view to reduce some portion of those burdens to which the land is subject, through the pressure of local and general taxation." The motion was seconded by the Earl of Darlington.

Lord John Russell, however, proved as little propitious to this intention to reduce the burdens of the people as Sir Robert Peel had been. He, strange to say, disapproved of a motion calling for a specific reduction of the taxes, and considered that the landed interest would be sufficiently benefited by what he styled improvements in the poor laws, and by the commutation of tithes. He ended his speech with an amendment, "That the House directs the early attention of the Government to the recommendations of the Committee appointed last session on the payment of county rates, with a view to the utmost practical alteration of the burden of local taxation."

There ensued a long and animated debate; but on the division the Government votes were 211 to 150. The subject, however, was not got rid of; for on the 1st of June, Mr. Cayley moved for a Select Committee to inquire into the means of affording relief to the agriculture of the country: to this was added a recommendation to consider the subject of a silver, or conjoined standard of silver and gold. Another lively debate followed; but it concluded with a larger majority in favour of Ministers.

The 2nd of June was a field-day in the House

of Commons for the Radicals, who, for the first time since they had assisted in restoring the Whigs to power, ventured to put forth their parliamentary strength independently of the Government. The occasion was a motion by Mr. Grote, the Banker, recommending the adoption of the ballot in electing members of the House. It was seconded by Sir William Molesworth, who also was a Radical. To obtain the support of the Whigs, both speakers attributed their recent defeats to the absence of this resource; but this idea they were too well informed to adopt. A long discussion followed, in which Sir Robert Peel and Lord Stanley, Lord Howick and Lord John Russell, Dr. Bowring and other members, shared; but eventually the question was disposed of by a division of 317 against 144.

Of course this result was gained by Conservative assistance, and was the first of a series of similar services which the Opposition found it necessary to afford, to save their opponents from the mischievous attempts at legislation of their Radical supporters.

On the 5th of June, Lord John Russell moved for leave to bring in a Bill for the better regulation of the municipal corporations of England and Wales. This was a Government measure framed expressly for the purpose of putting an end to alleged abuses which the Report of the Commissioners had dwelt much upon. There was no division on the first reading, and very little discussion, nor on the second, which took place on the 15th;

but when the clauses came to be discussed in Committee, much difference of opinion appeared in the House, and almost every speaker of eminence spoke on the subject; there was at last a division, which showed a majority for Ministers of forty-six.

At this period we were again embroiled in a foreign quarrel. Scarcely had England got out of the Portuguese contest when she was doomed to take an equally active part in another of much the same character, that had for some time been going on in Spain, where a movement in favour of Don Carlos had become so far threatening that the Queen Regent's Government applied to England, France, and Portugal for assistance which by treaty, it was said, they were bound to furnish.

A negotiation on the subject between Lord Granville and M. de Broglie resulted in an announcement in the *London Gazette* authorizing the enlistment of British soldiers for the service of the Queen, for the period of two years, to the number of 10,000 men—8448 infantry, 552 rifles, 700 cavalry, and 300 artillery, to be under the command of Colonel Evans, the member for Westminster, whose recent campaigns in Portugal with a similar force marked him out as in every respect the most proper officer in the English army to be employed in this service. The French were to send a contingent of 6000 men from Algiers.

Such an arrangement did not pass without comment in England; indeed, it elicited some sharp

animadversions from officers of rank and persons of influence, who could not reconcile themselves to making England a recruiting-ground for mercenaries to lose their lives in foreign civil wars of no possible interest to them; and among others who publicly expressed their dissatisfaction, was a general officer who had seen much service in the Peninsula during a contest in which this country had legitimate grounds for interference. It appears by the following letter that the Duke of Wellington while Foreign Secretary had sanctioned a part of this arrangement. He was much annoyed, and strongly expressed his displeasure at this having been alluded to.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Holdernesse House, June 7, 1835.

My dear Duke,

I am afraid, by not hearing from you, you are still suffering by gout in your hand. I have nothing of moment to report but the ill-humour of our chief, of which I enclose you two specimens.[1] You will have seen I pressed some questions some time ago as to the supplies and money sent to Spain: how and by whom provided. This was done without giving the Duke notice; because I thought P. and not the Duke was the culprit; however, I was deceived, and the blow was against his Grace. You will observe, he, most weakly and incomprehensibly in my opinion, abandoned his motion for the Order in Council—for which we were all prepared as a

[1] These letters appear to have been returned.

grand field-day. On the morning I got the note (No. 1) which I send, I answered shortly, and regretted that any circumstance of difference of opinion should induce him to change *old appellations* of thirty-five years' habit (he always addressed me as My dear Charles). To this reply I got the second note (No. 2). You will observe nothing but ill-humour through the whole of these notes.

I did not choose, in the H. of Lords, to let the Duke suppose that I entirely succumbed to his views, and so I urged two or three points I thought of moment on the question; and I hope still for a future discussion.

I write you an account of all this, as I have little else to say. You see Stanley and Peel pull together on corporate reform. Lyndhurst told me yesterday this Bill *must* last the session. Some expedient would be found for the tithe clause; and these questions would *certainly* tide on till next year. We have had great dinners and great parties. This week all the world at Ascot. The King dines at the D. of W.'s to-morrow, and is said to continue his sovereign ill-humour and disgust with his Ministers. Let me know how you are, my dear Duke.

Believe me, ever yours most sincerely.

VANE LONDONDERRY.

With regard to the last paragraph, we believe that the information it contains was correct. The Whig Government had been forced upon the King, and his original distaste was not lessened by a knowledge of that fact. The Ministers generally were extremely unpopular in the Palace; while his

Majesty omitted no opportunity of showing the estimation in which he held the Duke of Wellington. Even Lord Melbourne, with all his well-known social qualities, made no material progress in the royal confidence, though he certainly exerted himself to the utmost to secure it. The rest seemed content, as long as they felt themselves secure in their position.

CHAPTER VIII.

[1835.]

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS—THE GOVERNMENT DEFEATED IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS—INSTALLATION OF THE KNIGHTS OF THE GARTER—THE WHIG COMMISSIONERS OF INQUIRY—MEETING OF CONSERVATIVES—POLITICAL SPECULATIONS—RADICAL CRUSADE AGAINST ORANGE LODGES—BAD NEWS FROM SPAIN—TREATMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT MEASURES BY THE HOUSE OF LORDS—APPROACHING COLLISION BETWEEN THE TWO HOUSES—MEETING AT APSLEY HOUSE—PROCEEDINGS OF SIR ROBERT PEEL—PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT—O'CONNELL AND LORD MULGRAVE.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Ministers continued to proceed in a tolerably smooth course in Parliament, their majority in the Commons making all attempts at opposition anywhere almost useless. On the 26th of June, Lord Morpeth brought forward a motion on tithes in Ireland; and leave was granted to bring in the Government Bill for the regulation and appropriation of the Church revenues of that country.

The Municipal Corporation Bill made progress till the 30th of June, when Sir Robert Peel proposed an amendment in Committee, that in a town divided into wards no person should be eligible to serve in the corporation council unless he possessed property of 1000*l.* value, or occupied a house rated to the poor at 40*l.* This was resisted, and on the division Ministers had a majority of forty-four. The consideration of the succeeding clauses produced no further struggle.

The first reading on the 7th of July of the Bill "For the better Regulation of Ecclesiastical Revenues and the promotion of Religious and Moral Instruction in Ireland," only elicited from Sir

Robert Peel a threat of opposition in a subsequent stage. On the following day, Sir R. Musgrave moved the second reading of the Bill for the adoption of the poor laws in Ireland, which was opposed by Lord Morpeth and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but supported by Mr. O'Connell. There was much discussion; yet, though no division followed, the opposition of the Government was considered fatal to it.

On the 13th, the Earl of Radnor in the House of Lords moved the second reading of a Bill to repeal the law which required from university students subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles on Matriculation, and on taking the B.A. and M.A. degrees before the age of twenty-three. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Llandaff and Gloucester, and the Duke of Wellington strenuously opposed; and, though Lord Melbourne supported, the Bill was lost by a majority of nearly three to one.

In the Commons, the Irish Church Bill was read a second time without opposition; and on the 20th the Municipal Corporations Bill a third time and passed. The latter was read a first time in the House of Lords on the following day. An animated debate on the Irish Church Bill continued from the 21st to the 23rd, when Sir Robert Peel, after a most able exposition of the subject, in which he exposed the reckless misrepresentations that had been resorted to to prejudice the public mind in favour of

this measure, moved an amendment to separate the Bill into two portions—one for the recovery of tithes, the other for the appropriation of the surplus revenues. He was opposed by the Government and its supporters; and the division that ensued left him in a minority of thirty-seven.

The Municipal Corporations Bill came on for a second reading in the House of Lords on the 28th, when, after a discussion on the question of permitting counsel to be heard for petitioners against the measure, it was suffered to be read a second time. Counsel were heard on the 30th; and a long and important debate followed on the 3rd of August. The Earl of Carnarvon moved an amendment—

"That evidence be taken at the bar of the House in support of the allegations of the several petitioners, praying to be heard against the Bill now before the House, before the House goes into Committee on the said Bill."

This was supported in a powerful speech by Lord Lyndhurst, who contended that no individuals ought to be deprived of their property, to which by law they were entitled, unless properly convicted of having so far misconducted themselves as to be no longer fit to be entrusted with its management; and he stated his opinion that the report on which the Bill had been founded was wholly illegal. He called upon the House to stand on the principles of justice, to defy public clamour, to act as gentlemen as well as nobles of the land, without heeding con-

sequences; and then denounced the measure as, being under the pretence of reforming municipal corporations, a party job, intended to supply the deficiencies of the reform towards destroying the Conservative influence in the country.

The Duke of Wellington was also in favour of the amendment, which, notwithstanding the strenuous opposition of Ministers and their supporters, was carried on a division of 124 against 54.

The House, therefore, proceeded to hear evidence, which was continued from day to day; and the Bill was allowed to go into Committee on the 12th. On the 13th a debate ensued on an amendment being proposed by Lord Lyndhurst, "That the rights in common, as now enjoyed by freemen, should not only be continued, but that they should descend to those who should come after them," which was supported by the Duke of Wellington and other influential speakers, and opposed by Lords Melbourne, Brougham, Plunket, and Radnor, and the Marquis of Lansdowne. Nevertheless, it was carried against Ministers by a majority of ninety-three—thirty-seven peers only voting against it.

Lord Lyndhurst then brought forward another amendment, "That the rights as freemen, guaranteed to them by the Reform Bill, should be perpetuated," which, though Lord Melbourne opposed, was also carried. He then proposed a clause to the effect that instructions should be given to the different town-clerks to make out a list before the

25th of October next, of the persons entitled to their freedom in the several boroughs; and also for providing for the future admission of all who shall become entitled to their freedom, by birth, marriage, or servitude. This also was adopted, as well as an amendment of the Duke of Wellington allowing the boundaries to remain as they were until Parliament should otherwise determine.

As the clauses came under consideration, other improvements were suggested by the Opposition, and carried against Ministers whenever they ventured on a division.[1]

SIR W. H. FREMANTLE TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Englefield Green, Staines, Aug. 4, 1835.

MY DEAR DUKE,

I understand that the Knights of the Garter are invited to attend an investiture which is to take place for the two young Princes—Georges of Cumberland and Cambridge—on the 15th. I know not if his Majesty provides them lodging at the Castle, but should imagine it impossible. Should your Grace be disposed to attend the investiture, I should feel most delighted in accommodating you here, and it would give Lady Fremantle sincere pleasure to see you. The investiture is to be made with all the usual forms, and the dinner afterwards in the great hall belonging to the order. It will probably be a fine scene. I cannot say with what real pleasure I should greet your coming here; and if you feel pretty well—which, I trust, is the case—an excursion for a few days might amuse you.

[1] See "Hansard."

The times require some diversion of mind from the daily and hourly increase of dangers which surround us.

Believe me, my dear Duke, always with great respect,

Very sincerely yours,

W. H. FREMANTLE.

The proceedings of Lord Lyndhurst, it appears, were not at first approved of by the Duke of Wellington nor by Sir Robert Peel; but the former countenanced them subsequently, as is intimated in the following communication. It seems that his Grace was not desirous of committing himself to active opposition to the Government when no important advantage could be obtained; but, as on previous occasions, other Conservatives could not restrain their ardour for a contest when a triumph was possible, even though they may have been aware that it would prove a barren one. Hence the interest taken in their amendments on a measure which was popularly considered as of almost equal consequence as the Reform Bill; the result of which would unquestionably add greatly to the political influence of the Government.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

H. of Lords, Aug. 6, 1835.

MY DEAR DUKE,

We are going on with our examination *de die in diem*. As you will see from the papers, every case has proved incontrovertibly the partiality and misconduct of the nine-

teen Whig Commissioners; and I think the House and the public are well satisfied of the jobbing course which these gentlemen have pursued for the Whig Government's object — viz., to get all they could amass together of evidence, no matter how bad or incorrectly founded, provided it bore upon one side of the question and told against the corporations.

I hear the Duke declares now that he is satisfied with the course Lyndhurst pursued as the best. He is, however, reserved; and, if he stated the above, I know him too well to believe he likes in anything to be *overruled*.

It is conjectured by Saturday sufficient evidence will be procured to make us decide on taking a line against legislating on this report of the Committee. We shall then go to reject and amend all clauses, and send it back to the Commons, when it is supposed, after our searching and certainly just proceeding, the H. of C. will be *forced* to adopt the greater part of our alterations. So the case stands now. But it alters from day to day. Peel is not at all satisfied (I hear) at our course. He wished us to adhere strictly to the line of the Commons. You shall hear to-morrow or Friday how we get on. Melbourne came down * * * * * * and made a ridiculous bluster, which has done him harm. The Government seem very ill at their ease.

Ever yours most sincerely,

V. L.

From the next communication the reader will learn that the most complete union existed in the Conservative camp, and that a meeting had been held, at which a plan of action for the entire party was agreed upon.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Holdernesse H., Aug. 10, 1835.

My dear Duke,

We were pledged and sealed to the most profound secresy not to divulge what passed at our great meeting to-day. It is of the utmost importance it should not be known. There will be no schism in the party, and hopes are strongly held out that our large majority will enable us to make it a Conservative arrangement, which Lyndhurst has pledged himself to do. We could not take the leap of total rejection. If it be an entire new Bill, the H. of C. will be those who reject it, not us. So the case stands. If we had divided our party, we were lost. I conjure you keep this to yourself; but having your proxy, my conscience is clear, as I look upon you as being present. F******* was the only dissentient.

Ever yours most sincerely,

V. L.

No one of the Conservative leaders speculated more largely on political contingencies than the able writer of the preceding letters. With characteristic ardour and high spirits he was ready for any emergency, and even appeared to take a pleasure in imagining one, that he might show how easily it could be provided for. It was evident that he could always be relied on for a charge, whatever may have been the strength of the force and of the position opposed to him. This earnestness was often of great advantage to his political friends.

The Duke of Buckingham relied upon him for information as to the state of parties, and was not disappointed. No movement of interest escaped his observation, and his pen sent a short but faithful report.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Holdernesse House, Aug. 17, 1835.

I give you my word, my dear Duke, I would have written daily, if I could have afforded you more information than the newspapers. All you say is too true about the Bill. Lyndhurst would work it into a much higher key if he dared. But W********* and E********** play Peel's game, and we shall end in so modified a plan, that the Commons will take it as *a first step;* and really there is no party that I see *willing* to take the Government. If Melbourne resigned and Peel was called on, I doubt if the latter would accept and run the risk of a dissolution. We are to reject the Church Bill, I hear, on Thursday; and the impression is, the Government will tide it over till next session, laying upon us the onus of starving the clergy. Peel, and all the Conservatives of note in the H. of C. (as you know) have left town, and everything seems abandoned for the year.

It sometimes occurs to me, if Melbourne retired, and Peel would not take the helm, whether L******** would accept if called upon by the King and party, and have Follett or Praed as leading in the H. of C. after a dissolution, which must be the first step—Peel supporting, of course, the arrangement. In short, I look to everything,

and could talk over with you here a thousand projects. But writing is unavailing. I will certainly not desert your Railway Bill, *malgre* the Duke of Cumberland, who is mad about it. He has canvassed, and I fear got all you have named. I have your letter enclosed, and will mind the petition.

Ever yours most truly,

V. L.

I will write a line from the House if anything occurs.

The West Indian Slavery Compensation Bill was read a third time in the House of Lords on the 19th, and passed; and the Church of Ireland Bill a second time, with very little discussion, on the following day. On the 22nd, the time of the House of Commons was taken up with a violent debate on Orange Lodges. This institution had extended to the army, and the fact had been brought under the attention of Parliament, in an exaggerated form, by Mr. Hume, which had produced a resolution condemning the system, addressed to his Majesty, for whom his Ministers returned a reply, expressing a determination to prevent the formation of Orange Lodges in the army. Armed with this, Mr. Hume had moved the House to call to their bar an officer of the society in England, and he not choosing to appear, a warrant was issued for his apprehension. During one of the debates, severe remarks had been made against the Duke of Cumberland, because he was their grand master.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Aug. 22, 1835.

My dear Duke,

I have your proxy, and will enter it to-morrow before four, and do the needful with it. I showed your note to the D. of C., with which he was entirely satisfied, begging me only to assure you he would on no account have given it on the Bill, knowing your sentiments.

It is said Ebrington's resolutions have been rejected by the Government, and the Radicals are to be kept down, and the Government stay in and take the power and patronage of the long vacation, and see what will turn up.

I was in the City to-day, and one of the Bank Directors told me there was very bad news from Spain. His story was, that Evans's force had proceeded up the country, and fell into an ambuscade prepared for them, and a great slaughter had ensued. Alva, he added, was amongst the slain.

This report is not at the Club this evening. I cannot answer for it, but I have just seen Pozzo; he says the news is very bad, but he knows no particulars. You shall hear on Monday. I think this next week will give us the *denoument* of our piece. If the Government remain, Brougham, I hear, is to be recompensed by the woolsack, and Anglesey is much talked of for Admiralty.

Ever yours most sincerely,

V. L.

On the 24th, the Lords went into Committee on the Irish Church Bill, when some of the clauses were struck out, others amended, and a few allowed

to pass without opposition. But the first of the appropriation clauses was attacked by the Earl of Haddington, who moved that all from 61 to 88 inclusive, should be omitted from the Bill.

The amendment was supported by the Bishop of London, the Earls of Winchelsea and Roden, and by the Duke of Wellington; and the Government measure by the Marquis of Lansdowne, Viscount Melbourne, Lords Brougham, Glenelg, and Plunkett. On a division, there was a majority against Ministers of ninety-seven, and the obnoxious clauses were consequently struck out.

On the following day, the Municipal Corporations Bill was committed, when Lord Devon proposed an amendment, which was carried without a division; Lord Lyndhurst, a second, with a division that left the Government again in a decisive minority, they only bringing forward 36 votes against 104. Lord Lyndhurst moved another important amendment, which was also acceded to, and the remainder of the clauses was suffered to pass.

Another defeat was inflicted on the Ministry on the following day, when Lord Duncannon moved the second reading of the Irish Constabulary Force Bill. Lord Roden moved that it be read that day six months, and the amendment was carried by a majority of twelve. Lord Melbourne, however, made another struggle for the integrity of the Municipal Corporations Bill on the 27th, but was defeated by

a division of 160 against 89; and in its amended state it passed the third reading.[1]

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

House of Lords, Aug. 25, 1835.

MY DEAR DUKE,

We carried the preamble of the Railway Bill in the Committee upstairs to-day, 33 against 21, and I entertain no doubt we shall be triumphant in the House.

All seems mystery as to what the Government will do. Holmes says they are preparing, and positively will resign. I think Melbourne's manner indicates great apathy and arrogance; but at the same time, I am of opinion he will be satisfied with the Corporation Bill as we have *doctored* it; and giving up the Irish Church Bill this year, he thinks he will carry it in the next.

Ever yours,

V. L.

As a collision between the two Houses of the Legislature seemed imminent, it was essential that the Conservatives should be in perfect accord as to their proceedings. Another meeting of the principal members of the party was therefore held at Apsley House, and a plan of action agreed upon. The slight misunderstanding between the Duke of Wellington and the Marquis of Londonderry, noticed in a previous page, had disappeared, and their old friendly intimacy appeared to have returned.

[1] See "Hansard."

The Duke, as usual, was cautious; not disposed to go further than he could see his way clearly; but keeping his force at hand, ready for a demonstration whenever one could be made with real advantage. The crisis was one of deep interest; the House of Peers evidently not intending to give way on any material point; and the House of Commons, though extremely impatient of the restrictions imposed upon their legislative functions, undecided as to defiance or conciliation.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

House of Lords, Aug. 28, 1835.

MY DEAR DUKE,

We had a large meeting to-day at the Duke's. There was a unanimous feeling to go into Committee on the Irish Bill, protesting against its principle, but acquiescing in the consideration of it in Committee, for the sake of the famishing clergy, and with a view to reject the appropriation clause. The Municipal Bill, as you will see, is now settled. L******** says he will stick to his sixth.

To-day, we hear Ebrington has prepared a string of resolutions against the proceedings and decision of the Lords. It is more confidently stated than it was some days since, that the Commons will not accept the Bill.

The D. of Sussex told this to the D. of C. an hour since.

The plot is thickening, I wish you were here.

I understand the Railway Bill—that is, if the preamble is proved—will be decided in the Committee upstairs on

Monday, and then we shall have it (Tuesday) in the House; so send up your proxy, and I'll attend also the Committee on Monday. I hear it will be very hard run.

The Duke told us to-day, he did not think we ought to leave town until we fairly saw the course the Commons would take, and that might lead to the *middle* of September.

Ever yours most sincerely,

In haste,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

On the 31st, the Lords' amendments on the Municipal Corporations Bill were brought under the consideration of the Commons by Lord John Russell, who proposed some alterations; a discussion followed, which lasted till the 2nd of September, when a Committee was appointed to draw up reasons for a conference with the House of Peers, setting forth why their amendments were not adopted by the Commons. The tone of both Whigs and Radicals was not so violent as had been anticipated, though Messrs. O'Connell, Hume, and Grote took a prominent part in the discussion.

The conduct of Sir Robert Peel at this period caused dissatisfaction among some of his party; for he totally abandoned several of the important amendments which had been carried in the Upper House. This embarrassed the Duke of Wellington; but the Conservative peers, who were responsible for these changes in the measure, were not disposed

to surrender them. Their feelings may be learnt from the following.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Carlton, seven o'clock, Sept. 1, 1835.

MY DEAR DUKE,

You will get probably more ample accounts than I can give. Peel has thrown the Lords over. The question is, are we to yield to him as Conservative leader, or be firm? I hear from D. of C. to-night, L******** is firm, and that H.R.H. will be so. The Duke of W. is in a great dilemma how to act; his inclinations go one way, his friends push him the other. On Thursday we have a meeting at the Duke's to decide our course. Out of 140 of our party yesterday in the House, only 60 to-day. Come up if you can.

Ever yours,

V. L.

On the third of September, the Lords appointed to manage the conference with the Commons, were the Lord President of the Council, the Duke of Richmond, the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Bishop of Bristol, Viscounts Melbourne and Hatherton, and Lord Auckland; and on the following day, the alterations of their alterations were taken into consideration, when some were allowed, but certain amendments proposed by Lords Abinger and Ellenborough were insisted on and carried by considerable majorities.

On the 7th, Lord John Russell brought before the House the Municipal Corporations Bill, but expressed himself against any further opposition to the Lords' amendments; and though Mr. Duncombe stigmatized this course as degrading, it was followed.[1]

On the 10th, Parliament was prorogued by the King in person, with a speech, the great recommendation of which was brevity. It merely touched lightly on the contest in Spain, the slave trade, the Municipal Corporations Bill, the improved condition of Ireland, and the flourishing state of the revenue. The general tone was congratulatory, but there was nothing in any of its paragraphs to call for particular comment.

Thus had tided over this eventful session, leaving the Government secure in their places; the English Radicals quiet; the Irish Repealers equally so, and the more formidable Conservatives unable to take advantage of their superiority in the House of Lords or of their influence out of it. Why the Radicals had given them so little trouble, could not be clearly understood, unless it lay in the fact that they had lately lost their leaders, Cobbett and Hunt, and were not prepared to replace them.

The quietude of their Irish brethren was more easily accounted for. Disturbance at this time might mar the prospect of advantage that had opened upon the vision of that great political leader,

[1] See "Hansard."

who may have imagined that he controlled the Government; and that they were not unmindful of their obligations to him was clear from the conduct of the Lord Lieutenant. The appeal, "forget and forgive," was interchanged, and though its observance must have caused a hard struggle on one side at least, it appeared to have been adopted with commendable sincerity.

The following report will give the reader a pretty correct idea of the state of parties up to the date at which it was written. Speculations, as usual, were rife; but nothing could be considered certain, except the intention of Ministers to remain in office to the latest possible moment. The experience they had already gained had taught them lessons of wisdom, the full advantages of which they determined to obtain.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Wynyard Park, Nov. 6, 1835.

My dear Duke,

I have heard with great pain that you have been a constant sufferer with gout since I wrote my last letter and dissertation upon the unhappy prospects in our political horizon. And really I felt no disposition to worry you with letters, having no earthly *report even* to communicate; and I felt if I wrote, you might think yourself called upon to answer me, when you had rather be quiet. A letter some days ago from T***** gives a more cheering account of your returning convalescence, and I joyfully take up my pen to have a little confab with you,

prior to my departure for Ireland, for which place I start *all alone* in a couple of days.

This last month we have had a very large family party, thirty or forty to dinner each day—Lord Camden, the Ailesburys, Ravensworths, Wellesleys, &c., and we are really glad now to be a little quiet, and not always on the stretch. Our children are well, and people are tranquil and *apathetical* around us, and thus ends my private bulletin.

I heard nothing in corroboration of your last notions on politics, as to a probable approximation of moderates with Peel, from any of my other correspondents. On the contrary, my London friends wrote, the union and bond with O'Connell is to be permanent, as the only chance *all the Cabinet* have of keeping office (their sole object and aim), and they are now concocting a general tithe liberal composition measure for England, that will give them popularity amongst the agriculturists and farmers. And although they failed in deriving advantage from the Municipal Bill, they feel assured that they will ride on this new measure they have so eagerly embraced. I think this a more probable course of operation for them, than that *H***** should be negotiating against J***** R******, or that Peel, since his Church declarations, and since Melbourne's denunciation of his claptrap Ministry, could by any possibility be hastening to any sort of coalition. Peel has shown tergiversation on the Catholic question, and a want of political moral courage, if you will. But I hold him to be incapable of any diplomatic intrigue with any part of a party; he is too careless about office himself, and so is the Duke of Wellington, and this *insouciance* is the ruin of the Conservative Opposition.

From the Duke of Cumberland I have heard twice,

chiefly long details of the Radical manœuvres. From L******** I have not had a word, although I wrote twice, and sent him the D. of Cumberland's messages. Strangford informs me that L. is entirely wrapped up in dinners and soirées. From H. I never hear now; and how he has managed his game between his old commander, who is certainly far from pleased with Sir Robert and the Baronet himself, I cannot imagine. He (Sir Henry) of late, certainly seems to be holding and playing deep cards. The most outrageous thing in my mind that has occurred, and I am surprised it has not roused more indignation, is Mulgrave's inviting O'Connell *to dinner* at the Viceregal *official table*, after he had branded a Prince of the Blood as a bigot, and called all the Peers simpletons, maniacs, &c., and even the Duke of W. a stunted corporal. In defiance of all this, he is treated as a guest at Dublin Castle. Will Melbourne defend this on his legs? Why did he not instantly recall Mulgrave? If he cannot justify and sanction his proceeding, I think there are grounds here for a *home* attack on Melbourne. I cannot understand the King passing it over.

What do you think of M'D******, after all his palaverings, &c., going out of his way to receive Mulgrave. I am monstrous indignant at this. He will repent it sorely, or I am much mistaken. The co. of Down generally behaved as they ought. Only one gentleman went to Lord Dufferin's to meet his Excellency. I do not believe there will be any dissolution; the threat is held over the party to make them promise to be *good* boys. I don't indeed see what advantage Melbourne would gain by it.

God bless you, my dear Duke. Take care of your

health, and let me have a good account of you, and any news you can pick up, directed to Mountstewart, Newtonards. Lady L. joins in kindest regards; pray make mine to the Duchess, and believe me ever

Yours most sincerely and affectionately,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

CHAPTER IX.

[1836.]

DEPLORABLE STATE OF FRANCE — INFERNAL-MACHINE EXPLOSION — SEVERE RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED BY THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT — WHIG LIBERALITY IN ENGLAND — PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS — LORD SIDMOUTH'S SURRENDER OF HIS PENSION — THE DUKE OF CUMBERLAND AND THE CLAMOUR AGAINST THE ORANGE LODGES — DEBATE ON THE IRISH MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS BILL — VIEW OF POLITICAL AFFAIRS — REVOLTING FEATURES IN THE CIVIL WAR IN SPAIN — HUMANE INTERPOSITION OF THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY — DEBATES IN THE LORDS ON THE GOVERNMENT MEASURES — CHARGE OF SELLING A BOROUGH BROUGHT AGAINST MR. O'CONNELL — HE IS SUPPORTED BY THE GOVERNMENT — DISTRESS OF THE AGRICULTURAL INTEREST — TREATMENT OF THE MINISTERIAL MEASURES BY THE HOUSE OF PEERS.

CHAPTER IX.

We have for some time lost sight of the King of the French; but for this we may stand excused, it being well known that he never lost sight of himself. We should have, however, but little to record with the slightest pretensions to novelty—only additional proofs that the subjects of the deposed King were becoming more and more impatient of his successor. Unpleasantly to him was this feeling manifested from time to time. Times had changed indeed since he had been the choice of a Republic. The ruler who had been specially selected to govern a nation that had just recovered from a second paroxysm of liberty had found himself obliged to put a straitwaistcoat on the patient, and do his utmost to stifle his frantic notions. The result, as we have shown, was frequent conspiracies and constant prosecutions.

Scarcely, however, was one batch of conspirators disposed of than another presented itself. Hardly had one plot to assassinate been defeated than another was brought to light. The King of the Barricades found himself under the painful necessity

of proving that he was also King of the Prisons. It was in vain he sought employment for such of his subjects as seemed most eager to shoulder a musket in the new African colony. They would periodically take a fancy to try their weapon on his person. The grand system of fortifications invented for the security of the Parisians brought none to their Sovereign. Trials of regicides occupied the courts of law—the Senate showed their lively appreciation of liberty by refusing it to the slaves in the French colonies, because a pecuniary compensation to the masters must be the price of it—the press was shackled in every limb, and its silence every now and then enforced. In short, the system of things under Charles X., his greatest enemies must have allowed, was far preferable to that which had taken its place.

Under these circumstances the loyal people of Paris lived in constant dread of some more violent demonstration of popular hatred than any they had yet witnessed; and the Republicans sought every means in their power to baffle the numerous and active police by whom they were watched while meditating a new plot to overturn the Government, that should have better success than its innumerable predecessors.

Just before the usual Republican carnival of "the three glorious days," the plot made itself both seen and heard. It was worthy of its diabolical inventors—in truth, might have conferred credit on

any of the heroes of the Reign of Terror—and, to make the affair more characteristic, the chief deviser and performer in it proved to be a Corsican.

Having learned that the King was to attend a grand review, and must pass at a particular time the Boulevard du Temple, Fieschi, an ex-soldier in the guard of Joachim Murat, King of Naples, the brother-in-law of the Emperor Napoleon, hired a room, the window of which looked towards that thoroughfare. Here he secretly planted a formidable battery consisting of twenty-five gun-barrels, all charged with deadly missiles; and when the King, accompanied by his sons and attended by a numerous and brilliant staff, appeared before it, the whole were discharged.

The result was that fourteen persons were killed, among whom were Marshal Mortier, General de Verigny, Colonel Ruffe, Captain Vilalte, and the Lieutenant-Colonel of the National Guard, with four men of the same force; and twenty-seven wounded more or less severely, including four general officers. Among the killed as usual were harmless spectators: an aged receiver-general, a merchant's clerk, and two young females.

The King and his sons remained unhurt; the assassin might also have escaped, but in the discharge five of the barrels burst, and the fragments having wounded him in the face, made him less rapid in his retreat than he would otherwise have been.

General attention having been at once directed to the scene of the explosion, the place was immediately surrounded, and he was caught at the back of the house as he was descending by a rope.

This infernal machine, as it was called, had consequences as fatal to French liberty as to French life. The King's Government had recourse to more rigid restrictions—newspapers were repressed in every direction—caricatures and all kinds of engravings were put under what might be styled martial law—trial by jury altered so that a bare majority of votes *by ballot* would secure the condemnation of a political offender, and the sentence on his conviction was transportation to a penal settlement, instead of imprisonment in France. In August, seven of the Lyonnese insurgents, after a trial by the Court of Peers, were sentenced to perpetual imprisonment, two to incarceration for twenty years, and others to various terms from one to fifteen. While such was the fate of the King's enemies, attempts were made to increase the number of his friends and of the supporters of his Government by the creation of peers and the multiplication of offices—those suspected of the slightest tendency to opposition being subjected to extraordinary annoyance and the most arbitrary interference.

The whole of the municipal council of Thorigny resigned in consequence of the Minister of the

Interior having suspended their mayor, and in a declaration which they published at the time had the boldness to say, "As for us, we should feel ourselves disgraced by being at all associated with an act so iniquitous and a policy so disgusting. May our countrymen open their eyes to the abyss whither doctrinarian obstinacy is leading. Increasing taxation, the Revolution spat upon, the Restoration praised and imitated, the jury in disgrace, honour in the background, the enemies of freedom and the country caressed, its friends and those of the King disowned and persecuted:—such are the grievances which separate, by all their turpitude, the Ministry from the nation."

The intelligence of these proceedings created a profound sensation in England, where all sympathy with French revolutionists had evaporated, wherever there existed ordinary intelligence or principle. The impression was favourable to the Government, who took care sufficiently to point the moral, if they did not adorn the tale. Lord Melbourne strove to remove the stigma under which Liberal Governments had hitherto laboured, by the exercise of a little liberality towards literature. He was neither quite so discriminative nor so generous as Sir Robert Peel had shown himself in the previous year; for he contented himself with granting a small annuity to the widow of a Scotch poet, with one to an Irish novelist, and a still smaller one to an Anglo-Saxon scholar. However, it

was generally regarded as a good beginning, and those persons who took an interest in the subject solaced themselves with the hope that the Whigs were beginning to think of the claims of their country as well as their own.

The Ministers having filled up the vacancy on the woolsack with Sir C. C. Pepys, who was created Lord Cottenham, commenced the parliamentary session on the 4th of February, his Majesty, as usual, opening Parliament in person.

The speech delivered on the occasion does not, like its predecessor, call for much remark. It alluded to differences between France and the United States of America, and reported that an offer of England to be mediator, the King of the French had accepted; it then referred to the continuance of the civil contest in Spain, and to a treaty which had been concluded with that Power for the suppression of the slave trade. It was next stated that the estimates had been prepared with the strictest regard to "well-considered economy;" yet an increase of expenditure was announced. Commerce was said to be flourishing, and at last, the necessity of an inquiry into the condition of agriculture was acknowledged. Then the report of Commissioners who had been appointed to inquire into the state of the dioceses in England and Wales, was referred to, and a measure for better arranging the tithe system in the same part of the kingdom anticipated. The propriety of further law reforms was also sug-

gested. The speech then glanced at tithes in Ireland, and the reports respecting its municipal corporations and poor.[1]

In the House of Lords, during the debate on the address, the Duke of Wellington proposed an amendment, which was the omission of that part of it pledging the House to entertain the question of reform in the Irish corporations, and it was carried without a division—an ominous beginning. In the Commons, during the debate on the same subject, Sir Robert Peel moved the same amendment; but Radicals and Repealers came to the assistance of the Government, and they succeeded in obtaining a majority of 41.

The Government lost no time in bringing forward their measures. On the 9th, Lord John Russell moved to introduce a Bill for the Commutation of Tithes in England and Wales; and having explained the principle of his proposed measure, Sir Robert Peel accused him of having borrowed the whole of its machinery from the one he had proposed in the last session; the only difference being that, while the Conservative Bill showed the principle of a voluntary, the Whig Bill authorized a compulsory adjustment. Leave was given to bring in the Bill. The reproach made by Mr. Hume of stealing into other nests and hatching other eggs, might now be retorted. Indeed, it was too clear a case to be denied.

[1] See "Hansard."

In the House of Lords on the 12th, the Lord Chancellor moved for leave to bring in a Bill for the Consolidation of the Ecclesiastical Courts, which was granted; and on the same day in the Commons Lord John Russell obtained leave to propose measures for the registration of births, deaths, and marriages, and to amend the law regarding the celebration of marriage. This was looked upon as a strong appeal to the Dissenting interest, as it made a civil contract do duty for the time-hallowed religious ceremony.[1]

On the 19th, the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought under the attention of the House a fact that appeared to excite much surprise mingled with no slight degree of admiration. A pension of considerable amount had been surrendered—the second instance of the kind within men's memories. The reader may naturally enough imagine that such instances of liberality could only have proceeded from members of that political party that laid claims to exclusive liberality. This, however, was not the case.

No Reform Minister had made any contribution to the public treasury out of his own resources—no Reform Minister had surrendered a shilling of the public moneys that had come into his hands by way of recompence. Lords Camden and Sidmouth belonged to the old order of things; they were associated with that intense corruption and atrocious

[1] See "Hansard."

greediness which the new generation of statesmen had offered to replace with models of pre-eminent public virtue and perfect disinterestedness. It was thought more than passing strange, however, that while these much-abused yet most honourable men were enjoying the respect of their friends and the approval of their own consciences for such important sacrifices, two instances of a very opposite character among the ranks of their political opponents, should have attracted public attention.

Lord Sidmouth's political career has been noticed in the course of this correspondence. He was never a rich man. George III. had given him a life interest in the White Lodge in Richmond Park, and his successor had granted him a pension. On the death of Lord Stowell, on the 28th of January, his fortune descended to Lord and Lady Sidmouth; and this accession suggested to his lordship a step which he immediately adopted. In a letter addressed to Lord Melbourne he resigned his pension, which was thus acknowledged:—

LORD MELBOURNE TO LORD SIDMOUTH.

Downing-street, February 17, 1836.

My Lord,

I have the honour of acknowledging your lordship's letter of the 15th inst., which I will lose no time in laying before his Majesty. I beg leave to assure your lordship that I fully appreciate, as it deserves, the generous and

patriotic conduct which you have so promptly held upon the present occasion, and

I remain, my Lord, with great respect,
Your Lordship's faithful and obedient servant,
MELBOURNE.

On the 19th the following Treasury minute was entered:—

"The Viscount Melbourne lays before the Board a letter which he has received from the Viscount Sidmouth, dated Richmond Park, 15th February, 1836, requesting the favour of his Lordship to lay before the King, with his (Lord Sidmouth's) humble duty, his resignation of the pension of 3000*l.* granted to him by his late Most Gracious Majesty King George IV.

"My Lords direct that the charge for the pension of 3000*l.* granted to the Viscount Sidmouth be discontinued in future.

"Acquaint Lord Sidmouth that my Lords cannot give directions to carry into effect his Lordship's resignation of the pension granted to him for his official services without at the same time expressing their sense of the public spirit and disinterestedness which have induced his Lordship to abandon his vested right in a pension secured by Act of Parliament, and thus diminishing the charge upon the resources of the country."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, while communicating the intelligence to the House of Commons,

observed that he thought Lord Sidmouth entitled to the thanks of the House and of the public for the example he had set. Even Mr. Hume forgot his antipathies, and acknowledged that he was of the same opinion.

The second reading of the Tithes Commutation Bill took place on the 22nd without opposition, Sir Robert Peel making no objections, only contenting himself with expressing a hope that no measure would receive the assent of the House that did not render full justice in every particular to the rights of the clergy. On the following day, Mr. Hume in a long speech moved an address to the Crown for the removal of all magistrates, &c., who remained members of Orange lodges, or of any other political lodge, club, or society, bound together by oaths or signs. Lord John Russell moved an amendment for the suppression of such societies, which was carried without a division.

It was extraordinary the pertinacity with which the Whigs and Radicals strove to crush all organization of a Conservative character, while determinedly ignoring everthing of the kind where there existed the profession of opposite principles.

On the 25th his Majesty, in answer to the address, was made to state that it was his firm determination to discourage all such societies in his dominions, and that he relied with confidence on the fidelity of his loyal subjects to support him in this decision.

In the House of Lords, this proceeding created a warm discussion on the 26th, when the Earl of Winchelsea defended the society that had become so obnoxious to Government censure. The Duke of Cumberland, in an equally manly manner, stated that, though he was as much convinced as ever he had been of the purity of its principles, he was not desirous of countenancing what might appear like opposition to the Government, and that in consequence of the decision in the other House of Parliament, he had, in conjunction with several distinguished friends, taken measures to insure the immediate dissolution of all Orange lodges in Great Britain, Ireland, and the Colonies.[1] As this was exactly what the Whigs required, there was nothing surprising in Lord Melbourne expressing himself perfectly satisfied. A similar communication being made to the House of Commons by the illustrious Duke produced there the like effect.

The second reading of the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill was moved by Mr. O'Loughlen on the 29th; and although Sir Robert Peel, in his usual masterly way, analysed the measure at considerable length, and exposed the fallacies on which it had been founded, and Lord Stanley opposed it with equal resolution, it was agreed to without a division.

On the 7th of March another animated debate on the condemned Orange lodges took place in the House of Lords, when the Marquis of Londonderry

[1] See "Hansard."

brought forward a motion on the subject. In the course of his speech he denied statements that had been made respecting himself, and complained of interpolations in letters that had been published. He animadverted strongly on the partiality of the Government, and concluded with moving for copies of the proceedings of the Secret Committee of Inquiry.

Lord Melbourne not only made no objection, but expressed his hostility to all such societies, whether those in which Princes of the Blood were concerned, or political unions, in which operatives and manufacturers took the lead. This unfair insinuation brought up the Duke of Cumberland, who explained his connexion with the society as its Grand Master, and stated that its leading principle was, "Fear God and honour the King."[1]

On the same day in the Commons, Lord John Russell having moved the second reading of the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill, Lord Francis Egerton proposed an amendment, instructing the Committee, while providing for the abolition of corporations, to make such arrangements as might be necessary for securing the efficient and impartial administration of justice and the peace and good government of cities and towns in Ireland. It had lately become notorious that a most unfair advantage had been taken of the English measure to pack the town-councils with political partisans,

[1] See "Hansard."

by whom justice was about as much considered as good government; and as the result of this measure in Ireland must create an enormous increase in the influence of the Irish agitators, such an amendment was loudly called for. Though it was eloquently supported by Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, Sir James Graham, Sir Henry Hardinge, and other statesmen of eminence, it was so strongly opposed by the Ministers and the Repealers, that they on a division established a majority of sixty-four.

This result was regarded by some of the Conservative leaders with anything but satisfaction. Indeed, from the following communication it appears that there was considerable discontent existing respecting the position of the party:—

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Carlton Club, March 9, 1836.

My dear Duke,

I am afraid we are going *de mal en pire*. The division last night, which was proclaimed as the test of the session, has been worse than was even predicted; and what with those who took crotchets, such as Sir R. V***** and Co., such as are rats, and waiters upon Providence, who have now deserted us, and such as are *hunting* in the country to give sport to our great leader in the Lords (who has also entirely deserted us), as T** S****, we are in a precious way, and the Whig-Radicals will now be in, during our natural lives. The King also gives way in everything on the Church question. Graham's, Stanley's, and

Peel's speeches were all good and powerful last night; but O'Connell, more dictatorial and impudent than ever, after his own speech walked out of the House, and would not hear Stanley's reply. The D. of W. entirely cut us in our House when our personal characters were basely attacked. The House was full during my speech and the D. of Cumberland's. The benches then emptied, and we had no one to answer Plunkett. Rosslyn will not allow notes to be sent round during the Duke's absence.

The Lords go on as a small yelling part of a pack without a huntsman. The Commons take the trimming course on all subjects that are brought forward with a view of securing the dilly passengers; but it answers not in this, as it disgusts the household troops; and, in short, I never despaired so much of the Conservative party as at present. I think in my own business I made a good case. It is tolerably given in the *Times*. God bless you. When do you come? Not now, I suppose, until after Easter.

Ever yours most sincerely,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

The Report of the Ecclesiastical Commission was laid before both Houses of Parliament on the 10th, when Lord Melbourne explained the intentions of the Government, which were received with satisfaction by the Archbishop of Canterbury. On the 14th, in the House of Commons, the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought forward a measure for consolidating the Stamp Acts, the principal feature of which was a reduction on the newspaper stamp.

In the meantime the civil war in Spain, into which England had entered under the auspices of Colonel Evans, was carried on with a ferocity that outraged the feelings of the entire European community. The mother of Cabrera was shot by order of General Mina, and, in retaliation, the Carlist chief had ordered that all his prisoners should suffer the same fate. The British Legion was reported to be worn out with useless marches, and some of its members were likely to suffer from the brutal spirit of retaliation that then prevailed in the country to which they had been sent.

Among those influential persons in England who were anxious to interfere in their favour was the distinguished writer of the following letters, who had evidently come again into collision with his political chief on the subject of interposition. The Duke must have considered that some offence had been given him; but it is equally plain that his friend was not in the best of humours, not only with the conduct of the Duke, but with the aspect of affairs generally.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Holdernesse House, March 17, 1836.

My dear Duke,

As you may find time in the country (and are kindly interested in me) to read a long letter, I send you enclosed my case as I have laid it before Peel. The Duke

is grown perfectly savage, and forgets I am not now his adjutant-general.

I am grown thoroughly disgusted with all I see. Why make the Bishop of Exeter fire off, whip up for division in, and then by order of the Archbishop of Canterbury withdraw the motion?

Nothing can be more at loggerheads than we all are; and as you said in a former letter, the game is up for the session. I do not believe one word as to the notion you have heard of the report at head-quarters. It is mere delusion if it existed, and the friends of * * * need not lay that flattering unction to their souls. You know my opinion of H**** now. He is the last man I should consult or employ. He is greatly overrated, and a complete time-server for his own purposes.

I shall not stir from my position; and if the Duke feels he has used me ill, it is easy to say so. If not, I grow too indifferent about matters to travel out of my own beat; and I shall give up attendance most likely by degrees, but not to walk off like a beaten dog. You will come after Easter, I suppose.

Ever yours truly,

V. L.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

H. House, March 18, 1836.

My dear Duke,

I enclose you Peel's answer, which is handsome and gentlemanlike. I hear he has taken up the matter warmly. Aberdeen brings on Spain to-night, with a view that the Duke should make some *amende* to me. I suppose therefore all will be right, and I shall have the

triumph of forcing the release of those unfortunate men, as I did that of Col. Campbell.

Ever yours very truly and sincerely,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

The third reading of the Irish Corporations Bill was moved in the House of Commons on the 28th, when Mr. Shaw moved as an amendment, that it be read that day six months. This was seconded by Mr. A. Lefroy, and supported by Sir R. Inglis and Sir R. Peel; but the division showed a large majority in favour of the Government—260 and 199—and it was passed in the Commons.

Very little business of importance was done by either House of the Legislature till the 12th of April, when Lord Duncannon moved the second reading of the Irish Constabulary Bill. The Duke of Wellington then stated that the expense to the country under the system now proposed would be an addition of nearly two hundred thousand pounds a year, and expressed his objections to the patronage with which the Bill would invest the Government. A short discussion followed; but there was no division. On the same day there were two divisions in the Commons; one on a measure proposed by Mr. Ewart, and seconded by Mr. Hume, to sanction an equal division of property among children and next of kin, which was negatived by 45 against 29; the other, a resolution to abolish flogging in the army, brought forward by Major Fancourt and

seconded by Captain Boldero, which was disposed of by an adverse majority of 212 to 95.

There was a meeting of the leading Conservatives at Apsley House, to arrange a plan of action in reference to the Government measures about to come before the consideration of the House of Lords; but complete information as to the result was not to be obtained from the usual source, as the reader will perceive.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

H. House, April 12, 1836.

My dear Duke,

I did not attend the meeting, notwithstanding your better advice and judgment. I have, alas! a proud spirit, and I cannot bear being unfairly and unjustifiably treated, even by a Duke of Wellington.

I hope Lyndhurst will send you all that passed. I hear only we go into Committee on Irish Constabulary Bill, with a view to amend. We do the same with Irish Municipal Reform Bill. Taking F. Egerton's resolutions, I apprehend all this will fritter down into some patchings and understandings between the two Houses, to prevent collision, to keep the Whigs in place, to allow O'Connell a payment of interest on account, and to give the Government over to the Whig-Radicals for our natural lives. God grant that I may be deceived, but I fear and believe not.

Ever yours most sincerely,

Vane Londonderry.

On the 18th of April, the House of Lords appeared to be commencing the political campaign with some show of earnestness. Though the opposition to the Government of the Conservative division of the House did not take any practical result, it was apparent from the opinions then expressed, that a struggle was impending. Lord Melbourne, who seemed from his manner to think that his course could meet with no impediment, moved the second reading of the Irish Municipal Reform Bill, and explained its features with a quiet air of partiality, as if his own satisfaction with it must be conclusive as to its excellence.

Lord Lyndhurst, however, not only showed that he did not sympathize in those parental inclinations, but regarded the Bill with totally different feelings. Indeed, he pointed out the mischievous tendency of its provisions. He exposed its false pretences. He showed clearly that while pretending to remedy the preponderance of one political party in the corporations, it was transferring the entire influence to another much less likely to use it honestly; and he intimated that when it went into Committee he should propose alterations that would put an end to all real abuses, while providing for the due performance of civic government. After other peers had expressed their disapproval of the measure in its present state, it was permitted to be read a second time.

On the following day, the Benefices, Pluralist

and Clergy Residence Bill was also read a second time, after the Archbishop of Canterbury had explained its provisions. On the same day, in the Commons, Mr. D. W. Harvey moved for a Select Committee to revise the Pension List. The revival of this familiar performance met with difficulties. Lord John Russell was opposed to any interference with the present possessors of such grants from the Crown. There was a good deal of discussion on the subject; but the motion was negatived, the division being, for it 146, against it 268.

On the 21st, after Sir Andrew Agnew had obtained leave to bring in a Bill for the Better Observance of the Sabbath, Mr. Hardy brought forward a charge of breach of privilege against Mr. Daniel O'Connell, for having promised a seat in Parliament to a Mr. Raphael at the cost of 2000*l.*, which sum having been paid, and the candidate having been returned for Carlow, though totally unknown to the electors, he was subsequently unseated by the decision of a Parliamentary Committee. Mr. O'Connell made no defence, and Lord John Russell supported him with an amendment to Mr. Hardy's motion, substituting certain resolutions that embodied the report of the Carlow Committee, which had exonerated Mr. O'Connell from all suspicion of pecuniary peculation.[1]

Sir F. Pollock, however, though he refrained from pressing any charge of corrupt motives, took a

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

common-sense view of a letter addressed by Mr. O'Connell to Mr. Raphael, in which the price of the seat was named, as a breach of the privilege of Parliament. There ensued an animated discussion, in which the transaction was rather severely handled on one side, and most indulgently treated on the other; but the Whigs came so strongly to the rescue of their influential supporter, the Repealers to a man rallied to the support of their chief, and the English Radicals so completely made common cause with them, that Lord John Russell's amendment was carried by 243 to 169.

Nevertheless, some members were desirous that the House should not rest under the stigma of winking at practices so barefaced; and Lord Stanley moved a resolution that the agreement to appropriate money, as had existed in this case, was a dangerous precedent, and calculated to subvert the freedom of election. But again the Government, and again their friends and the friends of the accused, came to the rescue, and the motion was defeated by a majority of 238 to 166. This was in a Reformed Parliament, and to screen a member whose own election was shortly afterwards declared to have been unfairly obtained. The simple fact was, that Ministers knew that they could not maintain their positions, nor forward their proposed measures, without his assistance.

On the 25th, Lord Morpeth introduced the Irish Tithes Bill, ending a long speech explanatory of its

nature, with the resolution, "That it is expedient to commute the composition of tithes in Ireland into a rent-charge, payable by the owners of the estate, and to make further provision for the better regulation of ecclesiastical dues and revenues." This was agreed to, and the Bill read a first time.

On the following day, the House of Lords went into Committee on the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill, when Lord Fitzgerald moved an amendment, "That it be an instruction to the Committee that they have power to make provision for the abolition of such corporations, and for such arrangements as may be necessary, on their abolition, for securing the efficient and impartial administration of justice, and the peace and good government of cities and towns in Ireland."

Lord Holland and Lord Brougham defended the Government measure; Lord Melbourne rather indignantly contended that it would be better to go into its consideration, and assured the House that they would be taking a very imprudent step if they sanctioned the amendment. Nevertheless they sanctioned it by a majority of nearly two to one; Ministers were in a minority of 84.

On the same day, Mr. Rippon brought under the consideration of the House of Commons a resolution, "That the attendance of the bishops in Parliament is prejudicial." On a division it only obtained fifty-three supporters.

A much more important debate followed on the

motion of a member, on the 27th, when was submitted the following resolution—"That in the application of any surplus revenue towards the relief of the burdens of the country, either by remission of taxation or otherwise, due regard should be had to the necessity of a portion thereof being applied to the relief of the agricultural interest."

The necessity of some relief to the distressed agriculturists was acknowledged by all persons acquainted with land and its burdens; but it was known to the Government that a very large majority of landowners were politically opposed to them, and in consequence they systematically and obstinately denied them any remedy for the evils under which they laboured. This sort of policy could be understood—it was straightforward, if not just; but the policy of some persons who did not belong to the Government, and had distinguished themselves by their opposition to their measures, was not so easily explained.

The landed interest in the House of Commons supported the motion zealously, and there can be little question that Ministers would have been defeated if the entire Conservative party had shown equal fidelity to their principles; but a singular vacillation was betrayed by some of them—Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, and Sir James Graham deserting their friends, and voting against the resolution with the Government, who were thus able to

secure the small majority of 36 in a House of 380 members.

No business of importance was transacted in either House till the 9th of May, when the Lords went again into Committee on the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill. Though Lord Melbourne strongly urged the injustice which the amended Bill, as he averred, would inflict upon the Irish people, and though Lord Clanricarde dwelt on the awful consequence that might result from a collision between the two Houses of Parliament, on a division for the amended Bill, there appeared more than two to one; yet, during the consideration of other clauses, Lord Lyndhurst called upon the peers to put down agitation, and thwart the efforts of those base men who for their own sordid ambition kept Ireland in a state of turmoil and tumult. The result was, that all the obnoxious clauses were struck out.

On the 16th, a Parliamentary Committee pronounced Mr. O'Connell's election for Dublin invalid. He, however, had already arrived at the same conclusion, and having got one of his friends in the House to accept the Chiltern Hundreds, was easily returned for Kilkenny. On the 18th, the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill again came under the consideration of the House of Lords for a third reading, when an attempt was made by the Government, with an amendment, to replace the clauses thrown out; but it was a total failure, there being,

on the division, a majority against them of fifty-nine. The next day, the altered Bill came back to the Commons, when Lord John Russell and other members made a lamentation over this change in the character of the measure; the amendments were ordered to be printed; and as if to declare their own impotence, the House deferred their consideration to the 9th.

On the 1st of June, the second reading of the Irish Tithe Bill created an interesting debate of considerable length; Lord Stanley moving an amendment that proposed the conversion of tithe composition into rent-charges, for the redemption thereof, and for the better distribution of ecclesiastical revenues in Ireland. He contended that the revenues of the Irish Church, if properly distributed, were not more than sufficient for an adequate remuneration for the officiating clergy, and stated that the Government, in order to make a surplus, proposed to reduce their incomes "in a pitiful and beggarly manner." His amendment was powerfully supported by Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Gladstone, and Sir James Graham; but opposed with all the strength of the Repealers and Radicals, which, on the division, secured them a majority of thirty-nine.

On the 9th, Lord John Russell brought under the consideration of the House, the Lords' amendments to the Irish Municipal Corporations Reform Bill, which occasioned a debate of two days, during which, Whigs, Radicals, and Repealers expended a

large amount of indignation against the House of Peers; and Lord John Russell's motion to restore the fourth clause as it stood in the original Bill was carried by a majority of eighty-six. The subject was resumed on the 13th and 14th, when other clauses that had been struck out were restored.

A conference between the two Houses followed, and on the 27th, Lord Melbourne again brought the Bill under the consideration of the House of Lords, when the Duke of Wellington and Lord Lyndhurst insisted on the previous alterations being affirmed, and on a division, Ministers were left in a minority of sixty-four. On the 30th, Lord Ellenborough presented to the House the report of the Committee appointed to draw up reasons for disagreeing with the Committee, which were adopted.[1]

The third reading of the English Tithe Commutation Bill passed in the Commons on the 27th, without opposition; and on the same day, Lord John Russell stated the result of the conference with the Lords, and concluded with moving that their reasons should be taken into consideration that day three months.

On the 4th of July, the House went into Committee on the Irish Tithe Bill, and Lord Mahon moved the omission of the appropriation clauses, which created a debate, and by the division, the amendment was negatived by a majority of only twenty-six. Another defeat of the Government occurred in the

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

House of Lords on the 18th, when the amendments of the Commons on the Lords' amendments of the English Municipal Corporations Bill were negatived by a majority of nearly two to one. But when the Radicals, led by Mr. Hume, voted against the third reading, in the House of Commons, of the Established Church Bill, they secured a large majority.

On the 22nd, the English Tithe Commutation Bill was read a third time in the Lords, and passed; after which, the Irish Tithe Bill was read a second time, the Duke of Wellington intimating that he should propose some alterations in Committee. On the 25th, the Church of Ireland Bill went into Committee, when so many amendments were proposed and carried, that Lord Melbourne impatiently threw up the measure; stating, however, that he should retain his station. The Bishop of Exeter denounced the Bill as having been urged upon the Government by those who had been guilty of tremendous perfidy and perjury. On a division taking place on Lord Lyndhurst's amendment for the rejection of the appropriation clause, there was a majority against the Government of ninety-one, the opposition being more than two to one. And on the 28th, with these important omissions, the Bill was read a third time, and passed.

On the 1st of August, Mr. Walter, in the House of Commons, moved for a Select Committee to inquire into the operation of the New Poor Law,

particularly with regard to the rules for granting out-door relief, and the separation, in the unions, of husbands from wives and children from parents. In a temperate speech, he directed the attention of the House to the arbitrary character of these arrangements, and the outrage they committed on the feelings of the poor. Other members spoke to the same purpose; but Lord John Russell appealed to the economists, representing that a great saving had been effected by the new law; and in a very thin house, the cause of humanity was defeated by a division of 82 against 46.

After all the pretensions to sympathy with the people which the Whigs had of late years put forth, their persistence in regulations that had been found most oppressive to "the poor and needy, and those who had none to help them," created a feeling of bitter indignation among a large portion of the community. The proceedings in the Lords were tacitly encouraged by many persons who, a short time before, would have treated their alleged contumacy with a good deal of violent declamation. Now they plainly saw that the statesmen they had been taught to regard as the enemies of the people were their truest friends.

On the 2nd, Lord John Russell, on bringing the amended Tithe Bill from the Lords, though he spoke strongly against the proceedings of the other House, avoided a conflict by another resolution for postponement, which, after a spirited debate, was only carried

by twenty-nine votes. The contest was still carried on; for on the 11th there was a conference between Committees of the two Houses respecting their differences on the Municipal Corporations Act Amendment Bill; after which there was a debate in the Lords, when Ministers were again defeated. A second conference followed, without any satisfactory result. Lord John Russell felt himself obliged to have recourse to a motion that the Lords' amendments be read that day three months, and the Bill was abandoned. On the same day, an important amendment of the Lords in the Established Church Bill was taken into consideration, and carried by a majority of six.

Much to the relief of the Government, Parliament was prorogued on the 22nd by the King in person, with a speech which was only remarkable for the satisfaction that pervaded every paragraph. This feeling, however, it was impossible could have extended to the framers of the speech, unless it originated in the knowledge that their parliamentary labours were over for the session; for never in the annals of legislation had an Administration been made to appear so perfectly helpless.

Public opinion out of doors was evidently turning against them; at least, that real public opinion which expresses the intelligence of the country. This was partly owing to the arbitrary influence of their new poor law, and partly to the one-sided working of their measure for reform in English

Municipal Corporations. Nothing could be more opposed to English ideas of liberality and fairness than the effects of both; and the Conservative leaders observing the little support the Whigs were likely to find out of the House of Commons, in the House of Lords deprived every important measure they produced of its partisan features, while the entire nation, with some interested exceptions, looked on with quiet complacency. The fruits of the compact which appears to have been made by the Government with the Irish Repealers were thus withered in the bud—the entire sway over the Irish corporations, and a share in the revenues of the Irish Church, for which Mr. O'Connell expressed his willingness in Parliament to abandon Repeal. Hence the rage of those who had been disappointed. Threats and denunciations were heard and read throughout Ireland, and the tide of agitation again swept over the land.

CHAPTER X.

[1837.]

LOUIS PHILIPPE AGAIN SHOT AT—LOUIS NAPOLEON AT STRASBURG—SIR ROBERT PEEL ELECTED LORD RECTOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW—PROPOSED EQUESTRIAN STATUE OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON—CONSTITUTION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—THE WHIGS RESUME THEIR ATTEMPTS AT LEGISLATION—SIR ROBERT PEEL AND THE NEW POOR LAW—THE GOVERNMENT MEASURE RESPECTING CHURCH RATES—THEIR PROCEEDINGS IN SPAIN—THEIR DEFEATS IN THE LORDS—PUBLIC MEETINGS IN OPPOSITION TO THE GOVERNMENT—DEATH OF THE KING—ESTIMATE OF THE CHARACTER OF WILLIAM IV. BY LORD MELBOURNE, THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON, EARL GREY, AND SIR ROBERT PEEL—ACCOUNT BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY OF THE KING'S LAST MOMENTS—HIS FAMILY—HIS FUNERAL—THE DUKE OF CUMBERLAND BECOMES KING OF HANOVER.

CHAPTER X.

SINCE Fieschi's abortive slaughter, for which his own life was an insufficient atonement, the state of France had not improved. Louis Philippe was again shot at on the 25th of June by a Republican known as Alibeaud, with a walking-stick gun, near the gateway leading from the Tuileries to the Pont Royal, when the King was riding in a carriage by the side of the Queen and of Madame Adelaide. The assassin missed his object. He was secured, and on the 11th of July, 1836, beheaded as a parricide.

His fate did not calm the agitation which prevailed throughout the kingdom—in the Government apparently as much as anywhere; for on the 7th of September, in consequence of the resignation of M. Thiers, there was a new construction of the latter, which made six different Administrations in as many years. France seemed to be pursued by an angry Nemesis that never tired of showing the evils which had sprung out of her political excesses.

Another element of discord had lately appeared

on the scene to trouble the Citizen King. The Republicans declared themselves Bonapartists, and this becoming known to the members of the Napoleon family, it was thought that advantage might be taken of the movement. One of the Emperor's nephews, Louis Napoleon, with two officers and a few privates, suddenly cried, "Vive l'Empereur" at Strasburg; but this town was more famous for patties than for revolutions. Scarcely any one attended to the demonstration; the voices were quickly hushed, and the leader, after a short incarceration, was sent to the United States of America. About the same time Prince Polignac and his colleagues were liberated. Death a few days before had done the same service to their master, for Charles X. died at Gortz, in Illyria, on the 4th of November. This apparent clemency did not do Louis Philippe any service; for on the 27th of December he was again fired at, and again escaped.

The Liberal party in England had been trying to excite the public voice in their favour. Many meetings were held in the large towns, and many speeches were said and printed everywhere; but the old enthusiasm appeared to have evaporated. To make the failure more complete, Sir Robert Peel was elected Lord Rector of Glasgow in opposition to a member of the Government; and on the 11th of January his installation took place, when he delivered an inaugural address with immense effect.

On the 13th, a grand Conservative banquet was given in his honour, which was attended by between three and four thousand of the most respectable persons in Glasgow. As a counter demonstration, the Whigs got up a banquet in London at Drury Lane Theatre, in honour of Messrs. Byng and Hume, the members for Middlesex—Lord William Russell presiding; but all their exertions in the metropolis and in the country could not secure an attendance of much more than a third of that number.

The Duke of Wellington also appeared to be rising every day in public estimation, as fast as his political opponents were sinking. A design was entertained of erecting an equestrian statue to his honour in the City—the first of a long series of such testimonials of regard that were raised in London and elsewhere. The popular fury for dilapidations had quite calmed down; and although an occasional incendiary fire showed that the destructive tendency had not entirely ceased, there was a complete absence of that combination which had formerly made these manifestations of discontent so formidable. The only subject for agitation now left the Whigs and Radicals was church-rates, for the abolition of which they contrived to make a good deal of clamour.

It was in this state of public feeling that Parliament met on the 31st of January, when the King's speech for the first time was read by Commission—

an intimation of indisposition that created universal anxiety. This document, after the usual assurance of the friendly disposition of foreign Powers, referred to the state of Lower Canada, where some political disturbances had taken place, and recommended some inquiry into the Acts permitting the establishment of joint-stock banks—gross mismanagement in banking affairs having lately been brought to light. Finally, the affairs of Ireland were considered, and the wisdom of adopting improvements suggested. This was all the speech. Well might the Duke of Wellington in the debate on the address say, he had rarely heard one less open to objection: it was so short, that no room was left to find fault.

In the House of Commons a lively effect was produced during the debate on the address, from one of those unexpected revelations for which Mr. Roebuck has always been famous. He accused Mr. O'Connell of selfishness, and the Government of pandering to popular passions on one side, and to patrician feelings on the other. The first charge did not want proving; the second was an exaggeration of the policy of the Whigs, that made them in their difficulties gladly turn wherever they could find support. It was the natural result of their position. As a party, with all their earnest endeavours after self-elevation and aggrandisement at the expense of their political rivals, they had not succeeded in establishing a working majority in

either House of Parliament; and in the present session they were more than ever dependent in the House of Commons on persons holding opinions to which they were known to be totally averse. At this period there were various delicate shades of politics, which, however, required a very fine sense of discrimination sometimes to distinguish, they blended into one another so imperceptibly. Recognising these distinctions, the House was said to be thus constituted:

Whigs, 152; Liberals, 100; Radicals, 80 = 332
Tories, 139; Ultra-Tories, 100; Conservatives, 80 = 319

In addition, there was the Speaker and six vacant seats. These opposing forces were only similar in their strength when combined; but while perfect combination was difficult to the first, it was easy to the latter; and when the divisions among the ordinary supporters of Government made them antagonistic, the only chance for the preservation of the Whig element lay in seeking support from the Opposition. This had been done so frequently that it was regarded as a matter of course. The Radicals and Liberals, however, who were numerically superior to their Whig allies, began to be impatient, and the Government was forced into the usual temporizing expedients. Sir Robert Peel, too, had spoken out; and though no opposition was offered to the address, they were perfectly

well aware that there would be plenty to their measures.

On the 7th of February, Lord John Russell moved for leave to bring in a Bill for a Reform of the Municipal Corporations of Ireland, similar in principle to the one which, as he said, was rejected by the House of Commons last session in consequence of the numerous amendments introduced into it by the Peers. A long debate followed, that lasted for two days; but leave was given to bring in the Bill. On the 13th, he applied for similar leave respecting a Bill for introducing the Poor Law into Ireland, which received some commendation from Sir Robert Peel and Lord Stanley, and was not opposed by Mr. O'Connell. Leave was given.

The Radicals were not idle. On the 14th, Sir William Molesworth brought forward a Bill to abolish the Property Qualification of Members of Parliament, which was negatived by 133 votes to 104; and on the 16th, Mr. C. Lushington moved a resolution, declaring "That it is the opinion of the House that the sitting of bishops in Parliament is unfavourable in its operation to the general interests of the Christian religion in this country, and tends to alienate the affections of the people from the Established Church." Lord John Russell was obliged to combat this preposterous notion, which only obtained ninety-two supporters, and it shared the fate of the other.

On the 17th of February, the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill came on for a second reading in a very small house, when Mr. Scarlett proposed a clause giving to all burgesses in boroughs the power to elect aldermen, which was opposed by the Attorney-General; and the division was—For the Government, 93; for opposition, 34. Other amendments were proposed, but negatived without a division, and the Bill was committed. On the 20th, Lord Francis Egerton brought forward his amendment of last year, which occasioned a three days' debate, when all the strength the Government could display was produced, and they obtained a majority of 80.

On the 24th, Mr. Walter renewed his motion relating to the New Poor Laws. In the course of an able speech he introduced documentary evidence in support of his argument against the Whig system. He was ably seconded by Mr. John Fielden, an extensive manufacturer, who possessed abundant opportunities of noticing the working of the new law, which he denounced as false in principle and iniquitous in its provisions. He also charged the Commissioners with gross mistakes and intentional falsifications—a charge which few of the Government Commissioners have escaped.

Lord John Russell again opposed, and after defending the Government measure, moved as an amendment, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the administration of the

relief of the poor, under the orders and regulations issued by the Commissioners appointed under the provisions of the Poor Law Amendment Act." This was, in point of fact, though done with a bad grace, an acknowledgment that inquiry could not be avoided; and after two days' discussion a Committee was appointed. Sir Robert Peel at this period might have raised himself and his party to the highest pinnacle of favour had he taken a straightforward course against this unpopular measure; but he chose to stand forward as an apologist for the Government, and gave them a qualified support.

On the 3rd of March, the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought under the consideration of the House, when in Committee, the subject of Church Rates, ending with a resolution, "That it is the opinion of this Committee, that for the repairs and maintenance of parochial churches and chapels in England and Wales, and the due celebration of Divine worship therein, a permanent and adequate provision be made out of an increased value given to Church lands, by the introduction of a new system of management, and by the application of the proceeds of pew-rents—the collection of church-rates ceasing altogether from a day to be determined by law—and that in order to facilitate and give early effect to this resolution, the Lords Commissioners of his Majesty's Treasury be authorized to make advances on the security of, and repayable out

of, the produce of such Church lands." A long discussion followed, many members of different shades of politics expressing their opinions, but the debate was adjourned.

On the 6th, Lord John Russell submitted to the House a series of resolutions on the affairs of Canada. This occasioned a debate, which was renewed on the 8th, when, with Conservative assistance, the Government secured a large majority on the various divisions which then took place. The previous day, Mr. Grote had repeated his motion for the introduction of the Ballot. The Conservatives swelled the majority of Ministers to 112.

On the 9th, in the House of Lords, there was a strong expression of opinion from the prelates against the abolition of church-rates; and on the same day in the Commons, the Government, having been left to themselves in a contest with the Radicals, were defeated; the motion being one proposed by Mr. Duncombe for a repeal of the clauses in the Reform Bill which disqualified voters who had not paid their rates and taxes.

On the 13th, the House in Committee again considered the Government resolution respecting church-rates; when Sir Robert Peel delivered a powerful speech in opposition to them. His objection to the proposed arrangement was, first, as a measure of finance; secondly, because it was wholly at variance with the best legislative authorities;

lastly, because it was inconsistent with principles of sound policy and justice. Sir William Follett also opposed, putting prominently forward the legal arguments against it. Mr. Gladstone and Lord Stanley were equally earnest and fully as eloquent on the same side; but Ministers knew they had everything at stake. Their appeal was not only to the Dissenting interest; it embraced every political section opposed to Church and State influence; nevertheless, after a three days' debate, with the most strenuous exertions, they were only able to secure a majority of 23.

On the 16th, Mr. Clay brought forward a motion on the Corn Laws, its object being to establish a fixed impost instead of a graduated scale of duties. He was supported by only 89 votes.

In a very thin house another Radical measure was brought under the consideration of the Commons on the 4th of April. This was a proposition from Mr. Ewart to abolish the law of primogeniture. It shared the fate of its predecessors.

On the 7th, the Bishop of Exeter, in the House of Lords, while presenting petitions against the new Poor Law Act, made a powerful speech against that measure. It was on this occasion that the Duke of Wellington made an injudicious declaration that lost him the support of a large and influential portion of the community. He acknowledged himself in favour of the new Bill, and totally ignored the grave objections that had been urged against

it. There is no doubt that the conduct of the Duke and of Sir Robert Peel on this question materially affected their prospect of returning to office.

The third reading of the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill was proposed on the 10th, and met with strenuous opposition. It was, however, warmly supported by Mr. Hume as the representative of the English Radicals, and by Mr. O'Connell on behalf of the Irish party, and after a two days' debate was carried by a majority of 55.

On the 12th, Mr. Hume moved the second reading of the County Rates Bill, the principal feature of which was, the organization of a board elected by the ratepayers, to have the control of the expenditure. It was thrown over, the division being 84 against 177. The same fate attended Mr. Roebuck's motion to abolish the paper duty.

On the 17th, Sir Henry Hardinge moved an address to the King, "praying that his Majesty will be graciously pleased not to renew the Order in Council of the 10th of June, granting his Majesty's royal licence to British subjects to enlist into the service of the Queen of Spain; which Order in Council will expire on the 10th of June next; and praying also that his Majesty will be graciously pleased to give directions that the marine forces of his Majesty shall not be employed in the civil contest now prevailing in Spain, otherwise than in that naval co-operation which his Majesty has en-

gaged to afford, if necessary, under the stipulations of treaty." Sir Henry charged his Majesty's Government with compromising the reputation of England by the course they had pursued during the civil war in Spain, and narrated the sufferings of the British Legion, their ill-treatment by the Spanish Government, and their consequent insubordination.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Stratford Canning, who insisted that the question of succession ought to have been left to the decision of the Spaniards, and stated that there was nothing in the quadruple alliance that bound England to a military co-operation in favour of either party. The proceedings in this case, which last year excited the animadversions of Lord Londonderry, had, at last, in the House of Commons, elicited these indignant protests. Our interference was totally uncalled for, and the manner in which it was attempted, was considered humiliating. Recent events have proved that if we conferred any benefit on the Spaniards by our assistance then, or at any other time, it was not appreciated.

Lord Palmerston made a clever defence of the Government. He dwelt much on the obligations of treaties, and said that to sanction the address proposed, would be to offer an insult to our allies. In the division, Ministers contrived to secure a majority of twenty-six. The Irish Municipal Bill was read a second time in the House of Lords

on the 25th, with a few comments from the Duke of Wellington and Lord Lyndhurst, in which the necessity of alterations was clearly expressed.

The second reading of the Irish Poor Law Bill came on in the Commons on the 28th, and passed, after a two days' debate. The Radicals made two abortive attempts at legislation on the 4th of May, the first, to repeal the window-tax; they were easily defeated, as they only mustered forty-eight votes. On the second, to appropriate first fruits and tenths, when they obtained 63 votes against 206.

The Irish Municipal Corporations Bill went into Committee in the Lords on the 5th, when the Duke of Wellington moved an amendment, that its further consideration should be postponed till the 9th of June; and notwithstanding the indignant opposition of the friends of the Government, this was carried by a division of 115 to 77.

Political meetings in favour of the Government had become extremely rare. It was difficult to interest the people in their measures, or make them sensible of their prospective benefits. Much excitement was created in Yorkshire by a popular demonstration against them, which was made on Hartshead Moor, near Huddersfield, in consequence of a requisition to the Lord Lieutenant of the county, signed by 4000 householders, to consider the principle and operation of the New Poor Law. The result was a public meeting of a most extra-

ordinary character, consisting of nearly 100,000 people. They were perfectly orderly, and listened with profound attention to the speakers, whose arguments, it was evident, they unanimously approved. And after a series of resolutions had been passed, condemning the Whig system, the immense assemblage marched back to their several townships in separate divisions, with banners flying, bearing Scriptural texts opposed to the spirit of the new law.

On the 8th, the Government was again left in the Commons, to a contest with the Radicals, on Mr. D'Eyncourt proposing to repeal the Septennial Act, and managed to secure a majority of *nine*. After which the House went into Committee on the Irish Poor Law Bill, when Lord John Russell referred to the proceedings of the House of Lords, and urged the firmest union on the part of the supporters of the Government.

On the 22nd, when Mr. Bernal brought up the report of the Church-Rates Regulation Committee, Mr. A. Johnson moved, "That it is the opinion of this House, that the funds may be derived from an improved mode of management of Church lands, and that these funds should be applied to religious instruction within the Established Church, where the same may be found deficient, in proportion to the existing population." On a division, after two days' debate, Ministers had a majority of *five*.

The time of both Houses of the Legislature was devoted from the end of May to the 8th of June in discussing their privileges; but on the 9th of June Lord Melbourne moved the order of the day for going into Committee on the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill, when Lord Lyndhurst proposed another postponement, which was strenuously opposed by the Government, that had evidently assembled all their available strength in the House. Nevertheless, the amendment was carried by 205 against 119. This quiet, somewhat contemptuous way of getting rid of the obnoxious measure, and the manner in which it was submitted to, shows how completely the Government had sunk in public estimation.

Lord John Russell proceeded in his career, and on the 12th of June moved for a Select Committee to inquire into the mode of granting and renewing leases of the landed and other property of the Bishops, Deans, and Chapters, and other ecclesiastical bodies of England and Wales, and into the probable amount of increased value which might be obtained by an improved management, with a due consideration of the interests of the Established Church, and of the present lessees of such property.

The real object of such a Committee was evident, particularly the last portion of the resolutions. Sir Robert Peel therefore opposed the motion, as establishing a dangerous precedent, and objected to the

Government striving to shift their responsibility to the shoulders of a Select Committee. It was, however, an attack upon the Church of England, and the usual support being promptly given, Ministers on a division established a majority of eighty-three.[1]

On the 19th, another great political demonstration against the Government took place at Newhall Hill, Birmingham, by those once enthusiastic friends of the Whigs composing the Birmingham Political Union. There were 100,000 persons present, and Mr. Attwood addressed them on the distressed state of the country, after which a petition to the House of Commons was read, praying for a repeal of the corn laws, and of the new poor law, and for several other things of a more exclusively radical character, such as household suffrage, triennial parliaments, vote by ballot, and the payment of members of Parliament.

It was very clear from what was made known at the meeting, as well as from what had been published elsewhere, that the Reform Bill was regarded as an imposition. None of its delusive promises to the industrious classes had been fulfilled, and the manufacturing was in as great distress as the agricultural interest. Indeed, many branches of industry were almost prostrate. The farm labourers in parts of Scotland were in great distress; the Spitalfields weavers, 8000 looms being unemployed,

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

were suffering such privations that a public subscription had been raised for their relief, and a ball at the King's Theatre had lately been given, for the purpose of largely increasing the fund. In most of the manufacturing towns a vast number of workmen were unemployed, and almost everywhere the big loaf of Reform had shrunk into a mere crust.

It was at this crisis, when the Government appeared to have lost all moral support out of Parliament, and could only maintain political existence by having recourse to partisan appeals in the House of Commons, that an event occurred which afforded them a new lease of power. The King had for some time been suffering from indisposition; the anxieties inseparable from his regal position had apparently undermined his Majesty's health. He had lived so long a calm irresponsible life that he found it difficult to reconcile himself to the great change in his habits his elevation made necessary. Latterly his Majesty had taken less and less interest in State affairs. He had submitted to what he could not help, but evidently with a sense of weariness respecting political questions.

In the preceding month of April, the King's eldest daughter, Lady de Lisle, died, as well as the Queen's mother, the Duchess Dowager of Saxe Meiningen. Their loss made a serious impression upon his mind; and this appears to have aggravated the symptoms of disease under which he had been

labouring. His Majesty suffered from an affection of the chest, which on the 9th of June had become so serious that a bulletin was issued by his physicians. The Queen attended him with untiring assiduity and affection, without changing her dress for twelve days; but his Majesty grew worse, the circulation became more languid, the general decay more apparent. On the 20th he breathed his last. He had nearly reigned seven years, and was in the seventy-third year of his age.

His known goodness of heart and simplicity of character caused him to be sincerely lamented. His Majesty had put forward no shining qualifications, yet he had endeared himself greatly to all classes of his subjects. At a time of singular peril to the royal authority, he had been content to steer a middle course, as far removed from the habitual seclusion of George IV. as from the ostentatious familiarity of Louis Philippe.

The opinions of the King entertained by those who had enjoyed the best opportunities of becoming familiar with his disposition were thus expressed in the House of Peers. Lord Melbourne referred to his death as "a loss which had deprived the nation of a monarch always anxious for the interest and welfare of his subjects; which had deprived me of a most gracious master, and the world of a man—I would say one of the best of men—a monarch of the strictest integrity that it had ever pleased Divine Providence to place over these realms."

"The knowledge which he had acquired in the course of his professional education," added the speaker—"the knowledge which he had acquired of the colonial service, the knowledge which he had obtained in civil matters, were [was] found by him exceedingly valuable; and all the details of practical business were displayed by him in the most familiar and most advantageous manner."

Lord Melbourne appealed to every one with whom his Majesty had had business transactions, whether the details of public matters which his Majesty displayed were not of the most extraordinary character, and his attention to business zealous and unremitting. He stated that since he had had the honour of being his Majesty's servant, he often had had access to him, and a more fair or more just man he had never met with in his intercourse with the world. His Majesty gave the most patient attention even when his own opinion was opposed to what was stated, being most willing to hear what could be urged in opposition to it. "These," he said, "were great and striking qualities in any man, but more striking in a monarch."

The Duke of Wellington, with whom his intercourse had been more confidential, said: "It has been my lot to serve his Majesty at different periods of difficulty. My Lords, upon all these occasions his Majesty manifested not only all those virtues described by the noble viscount, but likewise that firmness, that discretion, that candour, and that

justice and spirit of conciliation towards others, placed as he was in circumstances in which probably never Sovereign was placed before. I say that probably there never was a monarch who, under such circumstances, encountered the difficulties he met with, with more success than he did upon every occasion."

"Notwithstanding," added the duke, "I had been under the necessity of opposing his late Majesty while Duke of Clarence, when employed in a high situation under Government, by taking measures which led to his Royal Highness's resignation of that office—that was far from causing any coldness in his Majesty when he came to the throne, for he employed me in his service, and ever treated me with the greatest tenderness, condescension, confidence, and favour, that so long as I live I never can forget."

Earl Grey thus expressed himself: "My Lords, I have, like the two speakers who have preceded me, had the honour of serving his late Majesty. I invariably found him a kind and indulgent master. I can bear my testimony to all those eminent qualities which my noble friend and the noble duke have both enumerated; for a man more sincerely devoted to the interests of his country, and better understanding what was necessary for the attainment of that object—more patient in considering every circumstance connected with those interests, or in the discharge of his duty on all occasions—

there never did exist; and if ever there was a Sovereign entitled to the character, his Majesty may truly be styled the 'Patriot King.' In addition to his other qualities of candour, of forbearance, of diligence, of activity and attention, by which he was eminently distinguished, he had that of patience in investigating every subject; and still more the knowledge which he had acquired both of the parliamentary practice and the principles of the constitution and the interests of the country; and as my noble friend has stated, he listened to objections to opinions which he had himself formed with the utmost kindness and attention."

Sir Robert Peel added: "He did believe it was the universal feeling of the country, that the reins of government were never committed to the hands of one who bore himself as a Sovereign with more affability and yet with more true dignity—to one who was more compassionate for the sufferings of others, or to one whose nature was more utterly free from all selfishness. He did not believe that in the most exalted or the most humble station there could be found a man who felt more pleasure in witnessing and promoting the happiness of others."

It might be thought that it would be scarcely possible to add to eulogy so high as this; yet the closing scene of this good King's career must be added to complete the portrait. At a public meeting held in behalf of the Metropolitan Churches

Fund Society, the Archbishop of Canterbury stated: "It was not many days since I attended on his late Majesty, during the few last days of his life, and truly it was an edifying sight to witness the patience with which he endured sufferings the most oppressive; his thankfulness to the Almighty for any alleviation under the most painful disorders; his sense of every attention paid him; his absence of all expressions of impatience; his attention to the discharge of every public duty to the utmost of his power; his attention to every paper that was brought to him; the serious state of his mind, and his devotion to his religious duties preparatory to his departure for that happy world where he hoped that he had been called.

"Three different times," added the prelate, "was I summoned to his presence the day before his dissolution. He received the sacrament first; on my second summons I read the Church service to him; and the third time I appeared, the oppression under which he laboured prevented him from joining outwardly in the service, though he appeared sensible of the consolations which I read to him out of our religious service. For three weeks prior to his dissolution, the Queen sat by his bedside, performing for him every office which a sick man could require, and depriving herself of all manner of rest and refection. She underwent labours which I thought no ordinary woman could endure. No language can do justice to her meekness, and to the calmness

of mind which she sought to keep up before the King while sorrow was preying on her heart. Such constancy of affection, I think, was one of the most interesting spectacles that could be presented to a mind desirous of being gratified with the sight of human excellence."

This portrait of Queen Adelaide is in no degree exaggerated, as many persons still living who enjoyed the happiness and honour of being known to her Majesty can testify. Her domestic virtues were as prominent as had been those of Queen Charlotte, and her devotion to her husband equally tender.

The King's disease was enlargement and ossification of the valves of the heart, attended with a distressing cough and difficulty of breathing. Towards the close, respiration and circulation became more and more faint; the Queen rested his head upon her shoulder, her hand upon his breast, and in that position his Majesty dropped into a gentle sleep, from which he never awoke.

By his will the King bequeathed 2000*l.* to each of his children, as well as equal shares in a policy of life insurance for 40,000*l.*—a modest provision. His family were—

I. *Sophia,* married August 13th, 1825, to Philip Charles Sidney, only son of Sir John Sidney, of Penshurst Place, Kent, Bart. He had been a Captain of the Guards and M.P. for Eye; was made Equerry to the King and G.C.H., July, 1830; Surveyor-General of the Duchy of Cornwall, March,

1833, and a Lord of the Bedchamber; and on the 8th of January, 1835, was created an English peer, by the titles of Baron de Lisle and Dudley. His lady had, in May 24th, 1831, been raised to the rank of a marquis's daughter, and was made Housekeeper of Kensington Palace in January of the present year, where she died.

II. *George*, who served with the British army in France, and subsequently in India. He became Captain and Lieutenant-Colonel of the Coldstream Guards, July 16th, 1825; Colonel and Aide-de-Camp to the King, and Deputy Adjutant-General, July 26th, 1830. In the following May he was created Earl of Munster, Viscount Fitzclarence, and Baron of Tewkesbury. He was afterwards appointed Lieutenant of the Tower of London and Governor of Windsor Castle, and was sworn a member of the Privy Council. Lord Munster published a book of Travels in India, and took great interest in the Royal Asiatic Society, of which he was Vice-President. He was also a Fellow of the Royal Society.

III. *Henry*, Captain in the 87th Foot; died in India, 1817.

IV. *Mary*, married June 19th, 1824, to Lieut.-Colonel Fox (son of Lord and Lady Holland). He was appointed Equerry to the Queen, July, 1830; was promoted to be Captain and Lieutenant-Colonel of the 1st Foot Guards in the following October; was appointed Aide-de-camp to his Majesty two

years later, in which year he became Surveyor-General of the Ordnance. He was also M.P. for Calne, for Tavistock, and for Stroud between 1831 and 1835. His lady was raised to the rank of a marquis's daughter, May 24th, 1831, and in September, 1835, appointed Housekeeper of Windsor Castle.

V. *Frederick*, commanded the detachment of the Coldstream Guards that surprised the Cato-street conspirators, and rose to be Lieutenant-Colonel in the 11th Foot, and afterwards in the Royal Fusiliers. Was appointed Equerry to the King, July, 1830; and extra Aide-de-camp with the rank of Colonel, in the following May, when he was raised to the dignity of a marquis's son. He received other appointments subsequently, and was made a Knight of the Grand Cross of the Hanoverian Guelphic Order.

VI. *Elizabeth*, married December 4th, 1820, to William George, seventeenth Earl of Erroll, who was appointed Master of the Horse to the Queen, July, 1830, and a Privy Councillor the following year.

VII. *Adolphus*, in the royal navy, in which he rose to the rank of Post-Captain. In July, 1830, he was made captain of the royal yacht, and Groom of the Robes. In the following year, was advanced to the rank of a marquis's son, and made a Lord of the Bedchamber in 1833. He was also Deputy Ranger of Bushey Park.

VIII. *Augusta,* married, July 5th, 1827, to the Hon. John Kennedy Erskine, Equerry to the King in 1830; he died in 1831, in which year she was raised to the rank of a marquis's daughter. She again married Lord Frederick Gordon, third son of the Marquis of Huntley, Equerry to the King, in 1830, who was a commander in the royal navy, and made a Lord of the Bedchamber in 1836. Lady Gordon became Housekeeper at Kensington Palace after the death of her sister.

IX. *Augustus,* in the Church, Rector of Maple-Durham, and chaplain to the Duke of Clarence, 1829. Chaplain to the King the following year, and raised to the rank of a marquis's son in 1831. He took the degree of Doctor of Civil Law in 1835.

X. *Amelia,* married, December 27, 1830, to Lucius, ninth Viscount Falkland, a Lord of the Bedchamber, and created Baron Hunsdon, in the English peerage, May 10th, 1832. He was also a Knight Grand Cross of the Guelphic Order.[1]

The surviving family of the King, at his decease, consisted of eight children and seventeen grandchildren. By his marriage with the Princess of Saxe-Coburg Meiningen, the Duke of Clarence had two daughters—both died in their infancy.

The remains of his Majesty lay in state in the

[1] Viscountess Falkland died recently. A few months before her decease she published some recollections of her residence in India, where Lord Falkland held an appointment.

Waterloo chamber in Windsor Castle, attended by one of the Lords, two of the Grooms of the Bedchamber, two Officers of Arms, four Gentlemen Ushers, six Gentlemen Pensioners, and eight Yeomen of the Guard; the body covered with a purple velvet pall, with the imperial and regal crowns, and usual royal insignia, was placed under a canopy of purple cloth, also ornamented with escutcheons, from which the royal standard and the national banners were suspended. On the eighth of July, at nine o'clock in the morning, the funeral procession was formed in St. George's Hall, and proceeded to St. George's Chapel. All the royal household took part in it; the Privy Councillors, the legal dignitaries, the prelates, the peers and their eldest sons, the Ministers, and the Officers at Arms. The supporters of the pall, were the Dukes of Wellington, Sutherland, Buccleugh, Northumberland, Richmond, Beaufort; and the Earls of Cadogan, Leitrim, and Surrey, and Lord Seymour. The mourners, were the Duke of Sussex, Prince George of Cambridge, the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen, the Prince of Leiningen, and Prince Ernest of Hesse Philipsthal Barshfeld.

After the service had been performed, and the royal body deposited in the vault, Sir William Woods, Clarencieux, Deputy to Garter Principal King of Arms, pronounced over the grave the following address:—

"Thus it hath pleased Almighty God to take out

of this transitory life, unto His divine mercy, the late most high, most mighty, and most excellent Monarch William IV., by the grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland King, Defender of the Faith, and Sovereign of the most noble Order of the Garter; King of Hanover, and Duke of Brunswick and Lunenburgh. Let us humbly beseech Almighty God, to bless and preserve with long life, health, and honour, and all worldly happiness, the most high, most mighty, and most excellent Princess our Sovereign Lady Victoria, now, by the grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, and Sovereign of the most noble Order of the Garter. God save Queen Victoria!"

In consequence of the crown of Hanover descending exclusively to males, the Hanoverian succession, with the Dukedoms of Brunswick and Lunenburgh, had passed to the Duke of Cumberland, as next male heir; who, with his family, had left England to take possession of his dominions.

Finally, the great officers of the royal household broke their staves of office, and deposited them in the vault, and the entire assemblage retired from the chapel. The Queen Dowager was present in the royal closet, as well as some of the members of the Fitz-Clarence family.

So passed from human observation all that was

mortal of William IV. His reign as a King, though short, was the most remarkable on record, for the extent and importance of the legislative experiments that distinguished it.

CHAPTER XI.

[1837.]

ACCESSION TO THE THRONE OF THE PRINCESS VICTORIA—FIRST ASSEMBLY OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL IN PRESENCE OF THE QUEEN—TAKING THE OATHS—FORMATION OF THE MINISTRY AND THE ROYAL HOUSEHOLD—RESULT OF THE GENERAL ELECTION—THE QUEEN AND LORD MELBOURNE—PROSPECTS OF PARTY—THE KING OF HANOVER—MEETING OF PARLIAMENT—CONSERVATIVE TACTICS—THE QUEEN'S STATE VISIT TO THE CITY—PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS—CORRESPONDENCE OF THE KING OF HANOVER—RETIREMENT OF LORDS ELDON, SIDMOUTH, AND WELLESLEY—DEATH OF LORD CLANCARTY.

CHAPTER XI.

THE accession of the Princess Victoria to the throne took the nation somewhat by surprise. On the 24th of May her Royal Highness had attained her eighteenth birthday—her majority according to a recent Act of Parliament; in consequence of which a great many congratulatory addresses were presented to her. The day was kept as a general holiday, and the night made brilliant by an illumination. A state ball was given at St. James's Palace in honour of the event; but partly from recent domestic bereavements, and partly from indisposition, their Majesties were prevented from attending. During the festivities that took place at Court and in various parts of the kingdom, no one imagined that in less than a month the youthful heiress presumptive would become Queen Regnant.

On the 20th of June, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Marquis of Conyngham (Lord Chamberlain) proceeded to Kensington Palace, where the Princess was residing with the Duchess of Kent, to inform her Royal Highness of the King's death.

Lord Melbourne was immediately sent for, and summonses were sent to the Privy Council to assemble at the palace at eleven o'clock, at which hour Queen Victoria, attended by the chief officers of the household, entered the Council Chamber, and took her seat on a throne which had there been erected.

Then the Lord Chancellor administered to her Majesty the oath taken by the Sovereigns of England on their accession, to govern the kingdom according to its laws. The Cabinet Ministers and the other Privy Councillors took the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, kneeling before the throne. The former then surrendered their seals of office, which her Majesty returned, and they kissed her hand on their reappointment. The Council ordered the necessary alterations in the official stamps and form of prayer, and drew up and signed a Proclamation proclaiming her Majesty. This was published with the usual ceremonies in the metropolis on the following day.

On the 22nd, a message from the Queen was delivered to both Houses, referring to the demise of her royal predecessor, and stating the inexpediency of proceeding with any public business except what was indispensable, till the assembling of a new Parliament. On the following day there was a discussion in the Lords, in the course of which Lord Lyndhurst made severe observations upon the Government, declaring Ministers to be powerless

in Parliament and incompetent in office. Lord Melbourne spoke in their defence, and appeared perfectly satisfied of the stability of his position and with the administrative talents of his colleagues. He knew that he possessed now the entire confidence of his Sovereign; and immediately took care that this feeling should not be disturbed by any hostile influence, by placing near her Majesty only such persons as would, he thought, be likely to support his views and maintain the favourable impression he had created. The result was, that he shortly became all powerful in the palace.

In the Commons, Lord John Russell announced that the members of the Government would remain in office, and continue to act with the most anxious desire to perpetuate the freedom and happiness of the empire. This appeared satisfactory to many; but the universal gratification with which the new reign was regarded made the nation almost totally regardless of the position of the Ministers, and this feeling was manifested at the forthcoming elections.

On the 17th of July her Majesty proceeded in state to prorogue Parliament. The royal speech for the occasion was carefully prepared, and delivered in a style that must have disarmed criticism. Its principal paragraphs referred to amity with foreign Powers, the diminution of capital punishment, and to what were called discreet improvements in ecclesiastical institutions. On the same evening a

proclamation appeared in the *Gazette*, dissolving Parliament.

The Cabinet at this period comprised—

Viscount Melbourne	*First Lord of the Treasury.*
Marquis of Lansdowne	*Lord President of the Council.*
Viscount Cottenham	*Lord High Chancellor.*
Viscount Duncannon	*Lord Privy Seal and Chief Commissioner of Woods and Forests.*
Right Honourable Spring Rice	*Chancellor of the Exchequer.*
Lord John Russell	*Home Secretary.*
Viscount Palmerston	*Foreign Secretary.*
Lord Howick	*Secretary at War.*
Lord Glenelg	*Colonial Secretary.*
Sir John Cam Hobhouse	*President of the Board of Control.*
Earl of Minto	*First Lord of the Admiralty.*
Lord Holland	*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.*
Right Honourable C. P. Thomson	*President of the Board of Trade.*

The Earl of Mulgrave was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with Lord Plunkett as Lord Chancellor, and Viscount Morpeth as Chief Secretary.

During the elections the Government used all its energies to get up that great political desideratum on such occasions, "a good cry," and they were not unsuccessful. The auspicious commencement of a new reign under a youthful Sovereign, was eagerly seized upon. It was confidently stated, and believed by many, that the young Queen had been brought up with liberal principles; that her Majesty regarded the Reform Ministers as her personal friends, and took the deepest interest in the success of their measures.

The old story of Tory corruption and misrule was again repeated; but though the people of England were just as easily cajoled, they were not

so easily frightened; as certain advocates of extreme opinions found to their cost. Names of mighty political influence a few short years ago, collapsed into insignificance under the test of a general election. Sir Francis Burdett retired from Westminster, and Mr. Hume was defeated in Middlesex. The former, however, again entered the House of Commons as the member of an English county (Wilts); the latter was obliged to accept an Irish borough—Kilkenny. One hundred and thirty-six new members were elected for England and Wales, twelve for Scotland, and twenty-three for Ireland; and the general result was in favour of the claims of property and talent.

In August the arrangements for the establishment of the royal household were completed, and the appointments to the principal offices were thus announced:—

Duchess of Sutherland	*Mistress of the Robes.*
Marchioness of Lansdowne	*Principal Lady of the Chamber.*
Marchioness of Tavistock; Countesses of Charlemont, Mulgrave, and Durham; Ladies Portman, Lyttleton, and Barham	*Ladies of the Bedchamber.*
The Honourable Harriet Pitt, Margaret Dillon; Caroline Cocks, Miss Cavendish, Matilda Paget, Miss Murray, Miss Lister, and Miss Spring Rice .	*Maids of Honour.*
Viscountess Forbes; Ladies Caroline Barrington, Harriet Clive, Charlotte Copley, Gardiner; and the Honourable Mrs. Brand and G. Campbell .	*Bedchamber Women.*
Miss Davis	*Resident Woman of the Bedchamber.*

The offices held by noblemen and gentlemen in the

late reign were retained, and the Whig interest at Court naturaly nurtured and strengthened. Everything was in its favour; and the Ministry, not insensible of their advantages, once more sought every opportunity of courting popularity, but now apparently with a less conspicuous leaning to extreme opinions than had previously characterized their policy. The result of the elections, though not unfavourable to them, was eminently suggestive. Except in Ireland the old fever of agitation had subsided, and could only be excited within certain limits, and there not for Whig objects. The very full report which will be laid before the reader will put him in possession of the tactics as well as the feelings of the Conservative party. The Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel were now more than ever indisposed for action, but some of their followers found it difficult to agree to this state of inactivity. They did not approve of allowing the Whigs time to strengthen themselves in their position by availing themselves of the support of their youthful Sovereign—of the truth of a report respecting the extent of this some sentences in the following communication will enable the reader to judge. It is evident from these revelations, that her Majesty was not disposed to abandon her judgment so completely to the influence of her official advisers, as some of them had anticipated.

With reference to the writer's remarks on the King of Hanover, it is necessary to state that he

was carrying on his government in a manner some of his old friends disapproved. He had by royal proclamation put an end to the Constitution of 1833 granted the Hanoverians by William IV.; but to make this agreeable to his subjects, he had ordered a reduction in the taxes.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Wynyard Park, Sept. 1st, 1837.

My dear Duke,

I was rejoiced to receive so satisfactory a letter from you, as it convinces me you are progressing, and gaining in health and strength. The tone of your communication, however, is certainly desponding, both as to private and public concerns. As to the former, we are all destined to travel the same road, and a little sooner or a little later ought not to weigh upon one's spirits one way or the other. Those who travel fastest are no doubt the happiest, and they have little to regret; those who lag a little behind are beset with painful recollections of those who have been in front. Political affairs, I agree with you, are most unpromising; and I think when I was in London, a few days since, I found only *frondeurs* and discontented partisans. It appears it is decided not to insist on a division on the Speaker; and as the Ministers have determined on a Conservative mediocrity, we are to bolster them against Radical assaults; and *au reste*, we are to take the chapter of accidents, and the result of petitions, for what may turn up. Now I am sick of this course of "As you were." Peel's partisans argue it is succeeding, and it must have more time. On the other hand, I

doubt if you will continue to keep a party together who are to be handed over to their opponents when it is convenient to the latter to call for them against the desolating inroads of revolution and Jacobinism.

The statesmen of the present day seem not to know that a body acting together must have the rewards of ambition, patronage, and place always before their eyes and within their expectation and belief of grasping, as well as the fine expressions of love of their country, and the patriotism which is a virtue. It may do for Peel and the Duke, whose cups of ambition are full to the brim, and it may be quite satisfactory to them to keep the Ministry from doing mischief without saddling themselves with the cares of office. But I believe they are the only two men in their party who are of this opinion; and if there are not more overt proceedings against the enemy in the next session than in the last, I am sure many of our friends will quit public life with disgust at this new order of conduct in both Houses of Parliament.

I hear Melbourne says, in all his numerous conversations with the Queen, he never has been able to extract an opinion in what quarter or where she has a predilection. This he has stated with great surprise.

It appears to me quite evident, from all I learnt in town, especially from E————'s language, who said he'd be d——d if they ever would resign, and that Melbourne knew how to please a woman much better than Peel, as well as from the tone of Palmerston's thanks to his electors, that there is not a chance of Melbourne's making his bow; and Parliament will probably meet in November for the Civil List. The petitions may give us some more members by Easter, and then we shall see if there is a chance of our party coming in.

We have been most triumphant here in city and county, and D***** is as bitter as possible now against me, although he was a *fidus Achates* on the banks of the Neva. He has plunged himself here into the Liberal boat; and although he has fine phrases of Conservatism in his manifesto, he will always find himself in a very awkward predicament to reconcile the two extremes of his declarations and his actions. As to his ever acting with Lyndhurst, &c., it is all quite moonshine.

No; I feel there is but one man and one party for us now, and that is Peel; and bad as the Conservative chance may be, rely upon it if that party is split into any section, the Whigs are in for ever. On this score, perhaps, it is as well that our friend the K. of H****** is out of the country, for it diminishes the possibility of an ultra party. The precipitancy with which he has acted has been most unfortunate. I'll send for your perusal, in a post or two, his last letters. He tries to make a good case for himself, but he should have thought who he was in England, and the crisis of the elections.

I am off for Mount Stewart in a few days. I have not been for several years on my Irish estates, and I shall spend four or five months there with great pleasure; for I really think there is nothing likely to call me in a public sense from home.

Keep me, my dear Duke, in your mind's eye; and as I am much further than you from the scene of action, if you hear anything, make some amanuensis give me a line. C****** will probably keep you well informed. Remember me kindly to him.

And believe me, my dear friend,

Ever yours most affectionately,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

That there existed an intention to keep the party well together may be gathered from the next communication, which, though brief, indicates the desire of a leader to concentrate his available forces:—

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Walmer Castle, Oct. 3, 1837.

My Lord,

Your Grace will have observed that the new Parliament will meet on the 15th Nov. It is probable that the business of the session will be opened in a speech from the throne on the following Tuesday, the 21st Nov.

The first and principal business of the early part of the session will be the settlement of the Civil List. There may be other questions of importance.

Your Grace will feel how important it is that you should take your seat at an early period, and that the House of Lords should be attended by its members from the moment at which Parliament will be assembled.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your Grace's most obedient humble servant,,

Wellington.

His Grace the Duke of Buckingham, &c., K.G.

On the 15th of October, Parliament assembled, and the Right Hon. James Abercrombie was re-elected Speaker. Her Majesty opened the Houses in person on the 20th, her progress and return

through the crowded thoroughfares being accompanied with acclamations of loyalty. The Queen read the speech with the same impressive manner as on the previous occasion; and, like its predecessor, it was framed so as to afford very little opening for hostile remark. One paragraph, referring to Ireland, and expressing the necessity of amendments in its institutions, presented the only debateable ground for politicians. It satisfied the House of Lords, and the address, which was moved by the Duke of Sussex, was carried unanimously.

A different spirit appeared in the Commons, where Mr. Wakley moved an amendment, pledging the House to the string of Radical propositions that had been more than once rejected. It was seconded by Sir William Molesworth, who denounced the Reform Act as a complete failure. On the division, their party could only muster 20 votes against 509.[1] This first trial of strength indicated the tactics that were to be pursued during the session, the Radicals opposing the Government, the Government gladly leaning for support on the Conservatives, whose chiefs, though confident of their strength, were indisposed to an active opposition that might prove embarrassing to their youthful Sovereign. The Radicals had less scruples, and the reader will presently see the coquetting of the Whigs to deprecate hostilities, and the subsequent

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

democratic demonstrations to force them to a more liberal policy.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Mount Stewart, Nov. 6, 1837.

MY DEAR DUKE,

You will have had, I conclude, the circular as well as myself. But I confess, to travel five hundred miles for a parade, without being allowed even to go through the facings, is not at all palatable to me. Besides, next week, my old co. of Londonderry has fixed to give me a great public entertainment for my constant consistent public duty. Having no connexion with them now, I consider this the most gratifying personal compliment that could be paid to me. As I could not, with this dinner, and the business of my estates in Derry, be emancipated by the 20th, I shall not, unless urged strongly, come to town until after Christmas, but remain quietly in Paddy's land.

I fear our course is to be *to propose nothing;* oppose, when the Cabinet (and of whom that is composed *I* do not exactly know), think it right, and yield a great deal. This course does not suit me, so I shall haul off till more active operations.

Give me a line, say how you are, and what you do.

Ever yours most sincerely,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

On the 9th of November, the Queen paid her first State visit to the City of London, and dined with the Lord Mayor and Corporation at Guildhall,

where preparations had been made on a grand scale for her Majesty's entertainment. The Queen was accompanied by the Duchesses of Kent, of Gloucester, and of Cambridge, and by the Dukes of Cambridge and Sussex, and Prince George of Cambridge; and attended in her state carriage by the Duchess of Sutherland and the Earl of Albemarle; the Ambassadors, Cabinet Ministers, and nobility, following in a train of two hundred carriages, that extended for a mile and a half. They left Buckingham Palace at two in the afternoon, and on arriving at Temple Bar, the customary formalities were gone through before opening the gate.

At St. Paul's, the Queen was detained by addresses and speeches, and, at half-past three, reached Guildhall, where her Majesty was received by the Lady Mayoress. The Recorder subsequently read an address, to which the Queen made a gracious reply, and then conferred the title of Baronet on the Lord Mayor, and the honour of knighthood on the two sheriffs. The banquet was worthy of the City's reputation for hospitality, and her Majesty returned to the palace at half-past eight.

The news from Hanover was far from satisfactory to those who thought the new Sovereign was taking too high a hand with his subjects. But it is just probable that his Majesty may have known them better than did those who criticized his proceedings. He, however, can state his own case.

THE KING OF HANOVER TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Hanover, Nov. 13, 1837.

DEAR DUKE,

Excuse my not having written to you ere this, but the fact is, that I have had so much to do, to see, to learn, in order to find out my *real* position here, that I have been unable to write; but now that I have become master of the whole state of things, I have been able to decide on the line I had to adopt; but a most difficult card I had to play, and until I could see my way plainly, I could not act true to my principles. I never will act nor do anything but in a legal way; and until I was confident I could not be foiled by acting otherwise, which people would have been too happy to have seen me do.

The last three years—ay, I may say, since 1830—Radicalism has been *here* the order of the day, as well as in England, and *all* the lower classes appointed to offices were more or less imbued with these laudable principles. I find, however, the nation united, and it has saved the monarchy. It is only since the 4th November that I can say I am *safe*, as I have cut the wings of this democracy.

I shall be abused by the Radicals, but, thank God, I have *all* the Conservatives here, and they outnumber the others. I send you a short account of all, which you are at liberty to *show*, but not to allow a copy to be taken. I trust you will do me the justice to believe me sound to those principles I have ever maintained.

Excuse the hurry of this, but to save the post, I must conclude,

Ever, dear Duke,

Yours faithfully,

E.

Very little business of consequence was transacted in Parliament. On the 27th, the Earl of Roden, in the House of Lords, brought forward a motion on the state of Ireland, in which he asserted that there was an organized conspiracy in that country, sometimes exhibiting itself in marauding and conflagration, but always aiming at the destruction of the Protestant religion. The Earl of Mulgrave denied that the Government had connived at any conspiracy, or that the appointment of persons connected with political agitation to office had tended to produce the violence complained of. The Duke of Wellington contended that it was quite idle to talk of tranquillity in Ireland, and ridiculed the distinction between agrarian and political hostility. He then brought forward statistics, which proved that crime had nearly doubled within the last eight years. Lord Brougham defended the present system of governing Ireland. Lord Roden's motion was agreed to.

The Bishop of London complained of a system of education, that appeared to have the sanction of the Government, and was to be purely of a secular character. On the 1st of December, the discussion was resumed, when Government Bills on the subject were read a first time. On the same day, Lord John Russell once more brought forward, in the House of Commons, a Bill for establishing poor laws in Ireland, which also was read a first time.

On the 5th of December, the Lord Chancellor, in the Lords, moved the second reading of a Bill for Imprisonment for Debt. The Municipal Corporations in Ireland Bill again came under the consideration of the Commons. On the 8th, the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought forward a motion for a Select Committee to inquire into the propriety of continuing the pensions on the civil list. This was an appeal to the Radicals, which was quite sure of eliciting a response; and as might have been expected, Mr. D. W. Harvey was eloquent in praise. Lord Stanley, however, a politician of a very different stamp, expressed his astonishment at the projected abandonment of principle and parliamentary faith.

The proceeding was but a renewing of the old see-saw policy which the Whigs had maintained since their possession of power. They now wanted Radical support, and they bid for it, turning their backs completely on their former professions. On a division, they secured a majority of sixty-two.

On the 12th, the Queen sent a message to the House, recommending an increased provision for the Duchess of Kent. Her Royal Highness's income was 22,000*l.*, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed that it should now be 30,000*l.*, which was agreed to. On the 15th, there was much discussion on the Civil List. Mr. Hume sought to reduce the grant from 385,000*l.* to 335,000*l.*, but could only muster nineteen votes on a division. Another

amendment to reduce it 10,000*l.* shared the same fate. On the 23rd, her Majesty went in person to give the Bill her royal assent and gracious acceptance. The Houses then adjourned.

During the latter portion of the parliamentary sittings, the dissatisfaction of some of the Conservatives in the House of Lords was exhibited by non-attendance, and was expressed in the following communications.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Mount Stewart, Newtonards, Dec. 3, 1837.

MY DEAR DUKE,

I have not written to you a long time, having truly nothing new to say on political subjects. All seems going on as much milk and water as possible, and I am delighted in my poor old shades to be out of the mess. I send you this line simply of inquiry after your health, as I am very anxious to know how you are, and if you have any thoughts of being in London before Easter. I doubt very much if I shall, unless prospects brighten. I must be in Durham the end of January for our great Conservative anniversary dinner, and probably shall break up from *here* then. But I shall remain at Wynyard or Seaham, or pay some visits so as not to have *London* before the latest moment possible.

Heartily rejoiced was I to escape O' * * * * *. How plaguy dull it must have been! The only good thing that appeared was, that I think the Duke of W.'s steam *was up*. Do you know now what he means as to

the Irish questions? I wanted that he should explain, but he has contrived to mystify more than ever.

Lady L. and all mine are well, and she desires to be most affectionately remembered to you; and believe me ever,

My dear Duke,
Most sincerely and affectionately yours,
VANE LONDONDERRY.

Pray let me hear of you, if only one line.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Mount Stewart, Dec. 17, 1837.

MY DEAR DUKE,

I was really rejoiced to see by your handwriting and the tone of your letter that you seem so much everything that your best friends can wish you. I still hope we may meet at Philippi. I have no temptations to go to town till Easter.

So T***** is at last ————. He will have a fine fortune, and I dare say will spend it nobly, being a very honourable and generous, though odd, fellow.

Are you not amused by M**** and B****'s reciprocal lecture on tongues? Such Peachems and Lockits! Rogues all, rogues all. For God's sake, don't send me any of K. E****'s "confidential and secrets." I have them all, and such lots of his difficult writing as if I were to be his *chargé-d'affaires* here. But this I will not be. I have urged him to hang upon M******. Hume seems to be opening a battery.

I write only one line to-day to prevent your sending the H****** documents. More shortly.

Ever yours most sincerely,
VANE LONDONDERRY.

The debate on the state of Ireland, referred to in the first of these letters, had brought out a long justification from the Lord Lieutenant, and a sharp remonstrance from the Duke of Wellington. Affairs continued in that unfortunate country to grow worse daily; O'Connell and his now numerous followers, being permitted to do very much as they liked; an occasional feeble attempt to maintain the supremacy of the law only showing that little authority was exercised in that portion of the United Kingdom.

The reference to certain correspondence in the last letter, shows how little sympathy existed between the extreme policy, or, as it was considered, impolicy, of King Ernest's proceedings in Hanover, and some of his old political friends in England.

Many eminent politicians had altogether withdrawn from the contest. Lord Eldon had placed his thoughts on higher objects. The infirmities of age were undermining his fine powers, and he was waiting at his town house in Hamilton-place the end of his long and distinguished career.[1]

Lord Sidmouth, not much superior in health, and equally resigned to the inevitable necessity, remained generally, and soon afterwards entirely, at the White Lodge, Richmond Park, enjoying the twilight of a well-spent life.[2] The Marquis

[1] Lord Eldon died in the following January.

[2] He died there on the 26th of April, 1842.

Wellesley, at Kingston House, Knightsbridge, was directing his intellectual resources from politics to literature, and amusing the leisure of a bright old age.[1]

Several eminent statesmen and diplomatists had passed away from the scene completely and for ever. Among them was Richard, second Earl of Clancarty, who had gone through an active political career since he moved the address in the House of Commons in the year 1802 as a supporter of the Pitt Administration. In 1804 he became one of the Commissioners for the Affairs of India, was sworn of the Privy Council in 1807, appointed Master of the Mint in 1812, and President of the Board of Trade in the following year. Soon afterwards he became one of the most useful and trustworthy of the eminent diplomatic staff that followed out the instructions of Lord Castlereagh at a period of unusual interest and political difficulty. His post was Ambassador Extraordinary and

[1] He published, early in the year 1840, a volume of classical productions of great merit, with the title "Primitiæ et Reliquiæ." On the 14th of March the author sent Lord Sidmouth a copy, with a note stating—"My sleepless nights have obliged me to call for relief on the nine old ladies whom we have so often visited together in the olden time. I now send you a little book of trifles which the importunity of various friends, especially Brougham, has induced me to collect for private use. It may amuse you for half an hour. There is a dedication to Brougham, who is the author of the printing, although not of the work. It contains a high but just panegyric on his eloquence. He has an excellent heart and an admirable temper, and his knowledge is boundless, and he has my and your enthusiasm for Homer, Demosthenes, and Virgil."—Pellew's "Life of Lord Sidmouth," iii. 456. Lord Wellesley died on the 26th of September, 1842.

Plenipotentiary to the Prince of Orange, Sovereign of the Netherlands, and his numerous able reports testify with what earnestness and fidelity he filled it.[1]

In June, 1814, Lord Clancarty was appointed Joint Postmaster-General with the Earl of Chichester, shortly after which he was named one of the plenipotentiaries from the King of Great Britain to the Congress of Vienna; and in Isabey's picture of this important conference, his strong features may readily be distinguished. He was associated with Lord Castlereagh, his brother Lord Stewart, and the Duke of Wellington. Whilst in the Austrian capital in the spring of the following year, he was nominated a Knight Grand Cross of the Bath; in August of the same year created an English Peer by the title of Baron Trench, the King of the Netherlands adding to his titles that of Marquis of Heusden. In May, 1816, he was again appointed Ambassador Extraordinary to the Netherlands, in which office he remained two years. In 1823 he was created a viscount. Lord Clancarty survived till November, 1837, when he died at Kinnegad, Westmeath, at the age of seventy.

[1] Many of them have been published in the twelve volumes of Lord Castlereagh's "Correspondence," edited by his brother, the late Marquis of Londonderry.

CHAPTER XII.

[1838.]

THE CANADIAN REVOLT—M. PAPINEAU AND THE REBELS—APPOINTMENT OF THE EARL OF DURHAM AS GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF THE COLONY — PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS RESPECTING CANADA — LORD BROUGHAM ATTACKS, AND THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON DEFENDS THE GOVERNMENT—DISSATISFACTION OF THE CONSERVATIVES AT THE DUKE'S CONDUCT—LORD MELBOURNE'S POSITION—DEBATES IN BOTH HOUSES—CHARGE AGAINST MR. O'CONNELL—HE IS REPRIMANDED BY THE SPEAKER—RADICAL ATTACK ON LORD GLENELG—CONSERVATIVE ATTACK ON MINISTERS—THEIR DEFEAT IN THE LORDS—LIBERAL ATTACK ON THE COPYRIGHT BILL—MEETING AT APSLEY HOUSE—FREQUENT DEFEATS OF THE GOVERNMENT.

CHAPTER XII.

After the French Revolution of the last century, St. Domingo thought proper to follow the example of the mother country. Every one knows how completely it succeeded in burlesquing French institutions, as well as in emancipating itself from French domination. The English Reform agitation having borne its fruit, offered a similar example to the colony of Canada, whose bent towards revolution was not only favoured by its large proportion of French population, but by the contiguity of the United States, and the constant endeavours of their "free and enlightened" residents near the frontier, to seduce British soldiers in the neighbouring garrisons, and republicanize the Canadian colonists settled in the adjoining districts.

The consequences were that considerable dissatisfaction had been exhibited among the descendants of the original settlers, who had not only maintained the national manners and customs, but the general detestation of England which the conquered colonists had handed down to them. Such a state of

feeling made political agitation easy, from whatever source it might proceed. A section of English society professing extreme opinions appears to have been not unmindful of the advantages this country possessed for propagating their political sentiments; and it is not improbable that the connexion the French Canadians still kept up with France may have afforded facilities for the diffusion of anti-English as well as anti-monarchical opinions.

The leader of the Republican party in the colony was a man of French extraction, named Papineau, who had great influence over his compatriots. From dissatisfaction having so many exciting causes, it is not strange that this should quickly have broken out into sedition, and from sedition into rebellion. The American sympathizers were active in their support, the British Radicals warm in their approval. Under their auspices, towards the close of the preceding year, a conflict took place at Montreal between the loyal Canadians and the supporters of M. Papineau, which was the commencement of a revolutionary movement.

The Royalists, however, supported the Government force, under Sir John Colborne, with such energy, that on the 19th of December the rebels were attacked at St. Eustace, and defeated. The next day the latter laid down their arms, and their leaders sought safety in flight. One of them, Dr. Nelson, was found concealed in the woods, but died two days after his capture. The loyal colonists

followed up their success by a demonstration against the sympathizers; for a steamer that had been very active in bringing assistance from the Americans to the rebels was surprised on the United States territory and destroyed. Another body of rebels, under Dr. Mackenzie, on the 5th of the following January, made a sudden attack on Toronto, but were repulsed by a force directed by the Governor, Sir Francis Head.

These transactions having been brought under the consideration of the Government, the Earl of Durham was appointed Governor-General and High Commissioner for the adjustment of the affairs of Canada on the day selected for the meeting of Parliament, which had been summoned to assemble on the 16th of January.

The House of Lords commenced their proceedings by Lord Glenelg presenting supplementary papers on the affairs of Canada. This elicited a discussion, in which the Duke of Wellington took a conspicuous part. He acknowledged that he entertained decided sentiments on the subject, and expressed his opinion that the Government ought to speak out their intentions. "I entreat her Majesty's Ministers," he said, in his usual impressive manner, "not to forget that we can have no such thing as a little war. I trust that the nature of the operations will be such as to make it quite certain that they will be attended with success."

In the Commons, Lord John Russell brought

forward the same subject. He seemed to be a little embarrassed as to which section of the House he ought to address himself, deprecated the hostility of the Radicals by apologizing for an intended suspension of the constitutional liberties of the disturbed colony, while he urged the assistance of the Conservatives to enable him to stifle disaffection and punish rebellion. He ended by moving an address expressing the satisfaction of the House that the designs of the rebels had been opposed not less vigorously by her Majesty's loyal subjects in North America than by her Majesty's military force there; and which assured her Majesty that, while the House was ever ready to afford relief to real grievances, they were fully determined to support the efforts of her Majesty for the suppression of revolt and the restoration of tranquillity.

The Radicals did not approve of such strong language; just as in the year 1830, when the agrarian riots and conflagrations had made legislative interposition necessary, the members of Parliament who stood forward as professed representatives of the people condemned the conduct of Ministers, talked lightly of the proceedings of "a few demagogues," and very severely denounced interference with the liberty of British subjects. Though their leaders spoke much to this effect, and Sir Robert Peel expressed his disapproval of the policy of Government towards Canada, the address was carried.

On the following day, Lord John Russell brought in a Bill to make a temporary provision for the government of that colony, after which Mr. Hume thought proper to give the House an explanation of his correspondence with the rebels. He opposed the motion, but on a division succeeded in mustering only seven votes.

On the 18th, Lord Glenelg, in the Lords, moved an address to the Queen, similar to the one that had been submitted to the Commons. The debate which followed possessed two remarkable features; one, an eloquent denunciation of the policy of Ministers, by Lord Brougham, in a speech of three hours' duration; the other, a forcible address by Lord Durham, of a singularly Conservative character. Each produced a powerful impression. The Duke of Wellington also made a speech which partook of the nature of an apology for the Government. This gave great offence to some of his party. After the damaging exposition of Lord Brougham, it appeared to some, quite a Quixotic enterprise in the Duke to come forward to shield his political opponents from censure. The professions of Lord Durham were not binding on any one, but those of the Duke of Wellington announced the policy of his party; and much indignation was excited in the minds of those among his followers who were strongly opposed to Whig measures generally, and could not reconcile themselves to their colonial policy.

It is evident a suspicion was entertained that there was a little mystification in the Duke's conduct on this occasion. It is possible, however, that he meant only to support the Government in their determination to suppress the revolt, and that he thought more present credit was to be gained, as well as prospective advantage, in encouraging them to act as much as possible in opposition to their Radical colleagues, than in joining the latter in abusing them.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Eglinton Castle, Jan. 28, 1838.

My dear Duke,

What do you say to your great man, the D. of W. Is he going to hand us all over, tied and bound, without "with your leave, or by your leave?" "I shall support the Government, and advise all my friends to do the same."

I thought a political leader directed the course and conduct of a party or an Opposition; but I did not know before he could become a partisan of those whom he fought against. His Grace not only excuses the errors which the Government admit they have committed, but has actually stated that the only censurable act of the Government on the Canada question was their not sending troops to replace those that had been drafted from Nova Scotia.

Now, after reading the papers, and coming to this conclusion, and hearing Brougham's speech (which I hear was admirable), I cannot but think there is more behind

in the Duke's proceedings than meets the eye. He has never, also, given an interpretation of his speech on such affairs. In short, my dear Duke, it appears to me, the game of our party is up. By what has occurred, Melbourne has all the Lords with him (saving the Lord of Vaux). He has an unbounded power from the Crown, a House of Commons entirely manageable (except with one section of twenty or thirty English Radicals), and an expedition before him, that opens patronage, the treasury, and the public voice without remonstrance. If this Whig Government, then, is not a strong Government—aye, and the strongest this country has seen for a long period, I am confoundedly mistaken.

I hear from London, that Ellenborough and Aberdeen were both prepared to speak, and follow Brougham, and would have made minced meat of the Government. *They* were in agonies, till this most unlucky speech set them all at their ease in a jiffey, and then there was nothing but glee and exultation in their camp. I also learn afterwards, that some of the D.'s *soi-disant* Cabinet, and W. in particular, spoke to him, and pointed out the ill effects likely to arise. His Grace then denied that he intended to say what in fact he did say, and made light of the matter. Since that, however, the D. has seen from the language held by Ministers, that they persist in fastening their interpretation on his words, in spite of Peel's denial of the justice of the interpretation. This, and the tone of the Government press, has had a great effect; the accounts from all quarters bring dissatisfaction from the Conservatives throughout the country at this speech. Peel is to try to do it away. But will the Duke *now* propose Peel's amendments to the Canada Bill in the Lords, if thrown out in the Commons;

and if our two leaders take different lines, what are *we* to do?

All this is most embarrassing; I am heartily glad to be out of it all, as I know I should have gone off at score after the Duke's speech. I am going to Durham in a few days for our Conservative festival. If Conservatism is still to be endured, pray give me a line to Ravensworth Castle, Gateshead. I think I shall not go to town till late; indeed, there seems no use going, as far as politics is concerned. I shall visit at Belvoir, and if you do go up to Pall Mall, I'll run over *en garçon*, and shake you by the hand. I trust, my dear Duke, your health gets on.

Ever yours most sincerely and affectionately,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

This is a somewhat unpromising picture of Conservatism, and probably a little overcoloured. With regard to its representation of the stability of the Melbourne Administration, there is reason to believe that it was in a great measure correct; and it was no doubt the Duke's conviction that their position was unassailable, which induced him to wait events, and in the interval to tolerate what he could not alter.

The Radicals having resolved to continue the contest in favour of the Canadian rebels, on the 22nd, Mr. Grote moved that Mr. John A. Roebuck should be heard at the bar of the House, as agent for the House of Assembly, Lower Canada, against the Government Bill. This having been consented

to, Mr. Roebuck enjoyed the privilege of abusing the Ministers, in a very long oration, in which they were charged with having created all the disturbances that had arisen in the colony; he ended with a warning that intimated its loss to England, and its gain to the United States. All this did not prevent the Bill from being read a second time.

Sir Robert Peel, on the 23rd, made an elaborate attack on the policy of Ministers respecting Canada, declaring that they were responsible for the recent melancholy occurrences. The Bill was committed, but the debate was renewed on the 25th, when Sir Robert stated his determination not to sanction the mixing up of the prerogative of the Crown with the legislative functions of the House of Commons, as was apparent in the preamble of the Bill; and on the following day, Lord John Russell announced that his colleagues had agreed to the alteration suggested. The Bill was read a third time and passed on the 29th.[1]

On the 2nd of February, Lord Glenelg moved its second reading in the House of Lords. The Duke of Wellington spoke at some length, not to attack Ministers, but to impress on them the necessity of providing for the defence of Canada the largest force the resources of the country would permit. He reminded them that the President of the United States had desired additional powers,

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

ostensibly to prevent hostilities on the part of citizens of those States with the inhabitants of Upper Canada, and referred to the probability of differences arising between Great Britain and America, which would demand the most vigilant attention of the Government of this country.

On the 5th, Mr. Roebuck repeated at the bar of the Lords the attack on the Ministers he had made at the bar of the Commons, which having been placidly listened to, the Bill passed through the Committee. A debate on the third reading occurred on the 9th, and though Lord Ellenborough opposed it as unnecessarily severe; Lord Mansfield, because it would neither give satisfaction nor effect the object desired; though Lord Brougham repeated his previous objections, and Earl Fitzwilliam condemned it, declaring that it would only be a forerunner of greater difficulties, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

On the same day, in the Commons, when the House resolved itself into a Committee on the Poor Laws (Ireland) Bill, Mr. O'Connell opposed it at great length; but on the division, he was only supported by twenty-five votes. On the 13th, there was a discussion that originated in a motion by Mr. Wakley, for an address to the Queen for a mitigation of punishment for five Glasgow cotton-spinners, who had been condemned to seven years' transportation for having belonged to an illegal society. On the 16th, Mr. Grote favoured

the House with his annual motion in favour of the ballot. It was opposed by Lord John Russell and by Sir Robert Peel. The latter having proved that it had failed in other countries, warned the House that as the ballot was an encroachment on the Charter of the Reform Bill, so in three or four years other proposals might arise to encroach upon the concession of the ballot. On the division, the numbers were—for, 198; against, 315.

Another attempt at legislation for the hustings was brought forward by Ministers as the Parliamentary Electors Qualification Bill, the third reading of which came on on the 19th, when it was vigorously opposed by Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Goulburn, and Sir W. Follett, as an alteration of the franchise created by the Reform Bill. It was carried by a majority of 17. On the 20th, Mr. Fielden moved to repeal the New Poor Law; but Sir Robert Peel came forward in its support, and the motion was negatived by a very large majority.

On the same day, Lord Brougham, in the Lords, delivered an eloquent oration on the evils of slavery, and moved an address to her Majesty to negotiate with foreign Powers for its extinction. As he also desired to abolish the apprenticeship system in our colonies, this was opposed by Lord Glenelg, and on a division, there were for Lord Brougham's motion, 7 against it, 31.

Considerable excitement prevailed in and out of the House of Commons, when Lord Maidstone, on

the 28th, brought under its consideration a charge of perjury recently made by Mr. O'Connell, at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, against the Election Committees. Mr. O'Connell having acknowledged that he had purposely and deliberately made the statement, contemptuously walked out of the House. A very animated debate followed, on Lord Maidstone's first resolution, that such language was false and calumnious. Ministers by an amendment endeavoured to get rid of the subject, but were beaten on a division by a majority of nine; and Lord Maidstone's second resolution, that the expressions were a breach of the privileges of the House, was carried by 293 against 85. His proposition that the Speaker do reprimand Mr. O'Connell in his place, occasioned a renewed debate; two amendments were lost, and on the 28th, Mr. O'Connell was reprimanded.[1]

A more important debate occurred on the 6th of March, when the Government was put upon its trial by the leading Radical members; for Sir William Molesworth, in a long speech, marked with considerable ability, moved "that the House do present a humble address to the Queen, respectfully expressing its opinion, that in the present critical state of many of her Majesty's foreign possessions in various parts of the world, it is essential to the well-being of her Majesty's colonial empire, and of the many and important domestic interests which

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

depend on the prosperity of the colonies, that the Colonial Minister should be a person in whose diligence, forethought, judgment, activity, and firmness, this House and the public may be able to place reliance; and declaring, with all deference to the constitutional prerogative of the Crown, that her Majesty's present Secretary of State for the Colonies does not enjoy the confidence of this House or of the country."

This was an attack quite as much upon Ministers generally as upon Lord Glenelg, and so Lord Palmerston understood it, when he moved the previous question; but now the Conservatives shared in the attack, Lord Sandon moving an amendment representing "that the open defiance of her Majesty's lawful authority in the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and the necessity of suppressing rebellion by force of arms, and of suspending the constitutional government of Lower Canada, are in a great degree attributable to the want of foresight and energy on the part of her Majesty's confidential servants; and to the ambiguous, dilatory, and irresolute course which they have pursued in respect to the affairs of Canada since their appointment to office."

There could be no mistake about the meaning of such a resolution, and Lord Stanley made it more clear by a satirical commentary.

The debate was renewed the following day, when Sir Robert Peel supported the amendment, which

he described as "in plain, direct, straightforward terms, arraigning the conduct of Ministers, without seeking for any confederacy with opinions to which the Conservatives were opposed." Sir William Molesworth having been persuaded by Lord John Russell to withdraw his motion, a division took place on the amendment, which left the Government in a majority of twenty-nine.[1]

On the 8th, the Marquis of Lansdowne in the Lords moved the second reading of the Parliamentary Electors Bill. The Duke of Wellington opposed it, stating that he was convinced it would do no good, and encourage further demands for change in the existing law. He moved that it be read that day six months; and on a division there was a majority against Ministers of sixty-five. It would appear from these divisions that there was an understanding between the Conservative leaders in the Lords and Commons; but nothing resulted beyond the display of Conservative strength. The Government proceeded as in previous sessions, ignoring their defeats, and confident of being able to maintain their places should a real struggle commence.

On the 15th, Mr. Villiers moved a Committee of the whole House to consider the Act 9th Geo. IV., cap. 60, relating to the importation of corn. The motion was opposed by several members. On a division the numbers were—for, 95; against, 300. On the 20th, another motion was made by Colonel

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

Seale to admit foreign corn under certain regulations, which also was opposed. On a division the numbers were—for, 127; against, 92. Leave was given to bring in the Bill.

Scarcely had the Government recovered from the attack on their colonial policy, when another was made on their foreign policy, which was equally damaging. Lord Eliot, on the 27th, moved an address to the Queen, expressing the opinion of the House, that no advantage had resulted to England or to Spain from the enlistment of our soldiers, permitted by the Order in Council which suspended the Foreign Enlistment Act, and praying that this Order may not be renewed. A debate followed, in which our recent proceedings in the Peninsula were freely canvassed. On the division, Ministers could only secure a majority of eight.

A Ministerial measure, brought forward on the 29th, on slavery, known as the Abolition Amendment Bill, after two days' debate, was carried by a majority of sixty-four; and the Controverted Elections Bill, moved on the 2nd of April, after an animated debate, obtained a majority of twenty-three only. A motion for the total abolition of the soap tax was negatived on the following day; after which another was brought forward regarding the Earl of Durham's expenses as Lord High Commissioner of the Canadas, and the member by whom it was proposed considered it expedient to call on the House to declare by resolution, that economy

ought to characterize the expenditure of the proposed mission; for as Lord Gosford's expenditure did not exceed 12,800*l.*, that sum ought to have sufficed for his successor.

It was shown that Lord Durham's appointments were extravagant, injudicious, and in several instances unnecessary; particularly that of a legal adviser with a salary of 1500*l.* a year. These arrangements, and all that related to them, were defended by Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston; but the exposure of their regard for their numerous professions of "the strictest economy" made some impression on the House, for on a division Ministers barely escaped defeat by a majority of *two*.

On the 25th of April, after a short adjournment of both Houses, Mr. Serjeant Talfourd moved the second reading of his Copyright Bill. It was opposed by Mr. Hume, who stated that he thought monopolies—under which category he classed an author's interest in his own productions—very bad things. He added, that the interests of the public ought to predominate over that of private individuals, and expressed his opinion that men of genius were already sufficiently rewarded. Such sentiments from professed Liberals were matters of course; but the Whig Solicitor-General went beyond the Radical economist, for he averred that copyright was a tax upon the public, and that nothing more ought to be given to authors than

would suffice to secure their talents for the advantage of the community.[1]

Fortunately for the credit of the House of Commons, one of those individuals thus absurdly charged with a design to tax the public, Mr. Disraeli, was a member of the House, and presently proceeded to enlighten that assembly as to the state of the case. A more narrow-minded, selfish policy than that which had been advocated—a more absurd proposition than the one advanced—had rarely been put forward in any legislative assembly. That a man's right in his mental labours should be circumscribed, while that over his acquisitions in land or in the Funds is acknowledged to be unlimited, appears inconsistent with ordinary conceptions of justice and honesty. It is vain to say that the former is for the benefit of the community, because the latter would be much more so. It is, in short, an exemplification of the Benthamite axiom—"the greatest happiness of the greatest number;" that is to say, the robbing of one Peter to give to many Pauls. And so generally was this adopted in the Reformed House of Parliament, that Mr. Disraeli's able statement produced only a majority of five for the second reading of the Bill.

The Irish Poor Relief Bill was on the 30th brought forward for a third reading; an amendment was proposed, but the Bill was carried with a large majority.

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

The Duke of Wellington did not think fit at this period to alter his tactics. His Grace had a meeting at Apsley House to state what he considered was the wisest course to pursue; but as this seems to have been to do nothing, it did not please those of his party who wanted to do a good deal. The writer of the next letter strove to obtain a more perspicuous declaration of his policy; with what result the reader will presently learn:—

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Holdernesse House, April 30, 1838.

My dear Duke,

I have not written to you since my arrival in town, because I have thought that on general concerns your relatives could give you much better intelligence of the plots of the day than I could. In good truth, I am much isolated; live almost entirely in my family, and take my own line. I think, however, I ought to say that L******** and I have more communication on public affairs than I have with any other person, and there is no doubt the Duke of W. is afraid of an independent action in the H. of Lords.

What can it avail going on as we do?

C****** will declare to you all the history and results of *his* dinner, and how he has been placed as the chief of the day.

Much may depend on how this day goes off. In the meantime disgraceful discomfiture and defeat induced me, considering the surprise on the question in the H. of C.,

"to give a notice of a discussion on Spain in the Lords. I knew the bother of the last year, with the D. of W.'s opposition, and I thought it most decorous to him *not* to ask advice, having determined on my own line.

I was urged, however, to address him in a few lines as to the form of the motion, and to discover the course his Grace might take. I did so, and I enclose you in another cover the answer I received.[1] I think you will admit that this is a virtual closing of the H. of Lords by its leader; and if the expression of our disapprobation is to be *nil* because we have not the *power* to carry our verdict into operation, and if we deny ourselves the moral good that should arise out of it, we had better at once put an end to ourselves.

By the Duke's doctrine we can have no interference, even without power. "Hence everything resolves itself into power, power into will, will into appetite, and appetite—a universal wolf—at last eats up itself."

Pray send me your explanation of this extraordinary production. It is not *suaviter in modo*, but a positive *fortiter in re*.

God bless you, my dear Duke,

Ever yours most truly and faithfully,

VANE LONDONDERRY.

On the 1st of May, Lord Wynford in the Lords, obtained leave to bring in a Bill to amend the New Poor Law Act, the principal object of which was to afford agricultural employment to the able-bodied poor. It was read a first time. In the House of Commons, Mr. Hume brought forward a motion

[1] Enclosure not preserved.

for the suspension of the payment to the King of Hanover of the allowance settled on the Duke of Cumberland. Mr. Spring Rice objected to such a violation of engagements; and Mr. Goulburn thought that if the House were to accede to this proposition it would give rise to the greatest evils. On the division the numbers were—for, 62; against, 97.

On the 3rd, Lord John Russell moved the re-appointment of the Select Committee of Inquiry into the Property of the Established Church, when he repudiated, in his own name and in that of his colleagues, the charge which had been brought against them of desiring to plunder the Church from the highest prelate down to the humblest curate. Mr. Goulburn admitted the existence of such an accusation, and affirmed its truth. Sir R. Inglis stated that the Government had no more right to alienate Church property than private property.

Sir Robert Peel, while opposing the measure, contrasted his own Administration with the existing one; the latter had, he stated, thrown all Durham and Northumberland into confusion, by having neither vigour to execute their plan, nor manliness to abandon it. Their position, too, he said, had altered materially within these three or four years: they could not now command their measures of hostility against the Church, for there existed a party in the Commons, in the Lords, and in the

country, determined to defend it. On a division there was a majority for Ministers of thirty-six. Then Mr. Liddell moved an instruction to the Committee, "That any surplus in the revenues be applied with the view of promoting increased means of religious instruction for the people," which was negatived by a majority of eleven.[1]

On the 7th, a conversation occurred in the Lords respecting the Yeomanry force, when the Duke of Wellington gave his opinion in its favour, as an available means of putting down local disturbances. On the 8th, Mr. Baines in the Commons brought under the consideration of the House the First Fruits of the Clergy, and moved for a Committee of the whole House to consider the propriety of abolishing them, and a better mode of rating and collecting the tenths for the maintenance of the poor clergy. On a division it was carried by a majority of forty-eight against twenty-seven, though opposed by the Solicitor-General. The House then went into Committee, when Mr. Baines proposed his first resolution, "That it is expedient that a better provision for the maintenance of the poor clergy of the Established Church of England and Wales should be afforded than that which at present exists, to be derived from the revenues of the said Church." Though there was much discussion, there was no division upon it, and its further consideration was deferred.

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

On the 9th, Colonel Seale moved the second reading of his Bill to allow bonded corn to be ground for foreign consumption. It was supported by Lord Worsley and several other members, on the ground that it would cause a large expenditure of capital in mills, and afford increased employment to labourers, who would be fed on home-grown corn, and that it would be a special benefit both to commerce and agriculture.

These fallacies were exposed by Sir Robert Peel, Sir James Graham, and other influential Conservative members, who proved that the measure was highly prejudicial to the farmer, while it would afford facilities for fraud and evasion. Nevertheless, the Bill was carried by a majority of seventy.

The Report on Mr. Serjeant Talfourd's Custody of Infants Bill was then brought up, and, though opposed by Sir Edward Sudgen, its reception was carried by a division of 91 to 18. The House subsequently resolved itself into a Committee on the Copyright Bill, when Mr. Wakley made another liberal demonstration at the expense of authors; but his amendment was negatived by a division of 116 to 64.

On the 10th, Sir Robert Peel brought in a Bill to amend the jurisdiction on controverted elections. It received the approval of the Attorney-General, and was read a first time. Sir R. Inglis then made an able exposition of the state of the foreign slave trade, which elicited the praise of Lord Palmerston.

His motion for an address to the Queen on the subject was agreed to.

Lord John Russell, on the 14th, moved that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Government resolutions regarding tithes in Ireland. Sir Thomas Dyke Acland proposed, as an amendment, that the resolutions be rescinded; which was seconded by Sir Eardley Wilmot. A long debate ensued, which was adjourned to the following day, when Sir Robert Peel, in opposing the motion, stated that when Mr. O'Connell called for the repeal of the Catholic Disabilities, if it had been known that the spoliation of the Established Church was included, the measure would never have passed into a law. On the division Ministers had a majority of nineteen.

On the 16th, the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought forward the Budget, which was remarkable for a decided increase in the public expenditure, and as decided a decrease in the revenue; the latter was more than two millions and a half; the former was stated to be more than half-a-million. The sum of thirteen millions in Exchequer bills had to be raised to meet the service of the year.

It was intimated in the last letter printed that an independent action was contemplated in the House of Lords, some of the Conservative leaders not approving of the policy of the Duke of Wellington, who not only refrained from opposition to the Government, but appeared disposed to support

them. Such a feeling made itself manifest on the 21st, when Lord Melbourne moved the order of the day for the second reading of the Poor Rates (Ireland) Bill.

This measure was not generally approved of by the supporters of Ministers. Earl Fitzwilliam opposed it, but the Duke of Wellington supported it, and said he expected that it would improve the social relations of Ireland, and the state of property there. The Marquis of Londonderry, who as an Irish landlord possessing large estates in three counties in the north, might be regarded as an authority on the subject, opposed the Bill, and moved that it be read a second time that day six months. Lord Lyndhurst more forcibly denounced the measure as a delusion, and stated that it would occasion a heavy tax on the small farmer, but expressed his opinion that no enlarged measure of relief was likely to come from the present Government, which only lived from hand to mouth.

Lord Brougham also opposed the Bill in an eloquent speech, recommending Ministers to govern Ireland discreetly, as it had been governed by the Marquises of Wellesley and Anglesea—settle the tithe and ecclesiastical questions, and conduct Irish affairs with a steady, manly, equal course of policy, in absolute good faith, without *chicane*, *favouritism*, or *shuffling*, and then they would see the wants of Ireland diminish, her comforts increase, tranquillity established, while the crafty priest might

intrigue and the ruthless agitator disturb in vain. With the assistance of the Duke of Wellington and his friends, the Government carried the second reading of the Bill with a majority of 129.[1]

On the 22nd there was a debate in the House of Commons on a motion of Sir E. Wilmot for abolishing Negro apprenticeship in the British colonies; it was carried by a majority of three. The discussion was resumed on the 28th, the Government bringing forward resolutions to annul the recent decision. They were warmly supported by Sir Robert Peel and Lord Stanley; and with the Conservative assistance established a majority of seventy-two. On the 31st the Lords went into Committee on the Irish Poor Law Bill. Lord Fitzwilliam proposed an amendment; but the original clauses were carried—the division being 107 against 47.

On the 1st of June the Commons went into Committee on the Irish Corporation Bill, when Sir Robert Peel proposed an amendment raising the franchise. On a division Ministers established a majority of twenty-six. On the 6th Mr. Hume moved the second reading of the County Rates Bill. Colonel Sibthorp denounced it, stating that he had never seen "a greater chaos of nonsense," and proposed, as an amendment, that it be read that day six months. The amendment was carried by 105 to 37. Colonel Sibthorp followed up his success by dividing the House on the Expenses of Election

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

Bill on the question that the Chairman do leave the chair, which he carried by 71 to 43. A third Bill—the Married Woman's Bill—was then defeated, on a motion of Sir E. Sugden, by 56 to 21; and a fourth—the High Sheriff's Bill—met with a similar fate without a division.

On the 11th the House went into Committee on the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill, when Sir Robert Peel again with great eloquence urged his objections. There was a division on the sixth clause, in which Ministers appeared in a majority of twenty. On the 22nd, on the second reading of the Factories Regulation Bill, for curtailing the hours of labour, severe strictures were passed on Ministers, and the motion was carried by a majority of eight. On the 25th Lord John Russell moved the third reading of the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill. Lord Francis Egerton proposed that it be read that day three months; and the amendment was supported by Sir Robert Peel, but it was defeated by a majority of thirty-five.

These fluctuating majorities indicated a loss of material power to the Government; while the able political discourses of Sir Robert Peel were daily making a more favourable impression on the thinking portion of the community. A subject of engrossing interest, however, diverted public attention for a time from politics; and such signs of the times were but little considered beyond the immediate influence of Parliament.

In the meantime the King of the French had proceeded on his uneasy course—more attempts at assassination threatening his life—more infernal machines were invented for the total destruction of himself and family. The last batch of conspirators were tried on the 25th, and after they had been sentenced, one made a desperate resistance to his guard, amid such discordant cries of sympathy from the spectators, that the President was obliged to have recourse to an armed force to clear the court.

CHAPTER XIII.

[1838.]

CORONATION OF THE QUEEN—AN ABBREVIATED CEREMONY RESOLVED UPON—INTEREST TAKEN IN THE SPECTACLE—THE PROCESSION—ARRANGEMENTS IN THE ABBEY—THE ROYAL FAMILY AND GREAT OFFICERS OF STATE—THE QUEEN—THE LADIES OF THE COURT—THE ACT OF HOMAGE—A NEW CROWN—ENTERTAINMENTS IN HONOUR OF THE OCCASION—ALLOWANCE TO THE DUKE OF SUSSEX—MAJORITY IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT—MARSHAL SOULT'S VISIT—CREATIONS—THE LORDS AGAIN DEFEAT THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (IRELAND) BILL BY LARGE MAJORITIES—ILLEGAL ACTS OF LORD DURHAM IN CANADA—DEBATES ON THE SUBJECT IN BOTH HOUSES—PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT—RISE OF CHARTISM—THE BIRMINGHAM AND THE MANCHESTER SCHOOL OF POLITICS—VISIT OF THE KING AND QUEEN OF THE BELGIANS—SECOND REBELLION IN CANADA—INVASIONS OF THE COLONY DEFEATED—REPRESSIVE POLICY OF THE WHIGS—STATE OF AFFAIRS IN INDIA DESCRIBED BY SIR GORE OUSELEY—VIEWS OF RUSSIA IN CENTRAL ASIA.

CHAPTER XIII.

SINCE the Queen's accession there had been much speculation throughout the country respecting her coronation. It had been nearly two centuries since the last Queen Regnant had been crowned alone—April 23rd, o.s., 1702; and though the ceremony then excited unusual interest, as having been the first of the kind for nearly two hundred years—Queen Elizabeth's having occurred in the year 1558—there were features of interest in the coronation of Queen Victoria of which her predecessors could not boast.

Her Majesty was in her maiden youth, and possessed of much personal attraction. Queen Anne had long been a wife and a mother, and was so gouty and corpulent that much walking in the ceremony was out of the question, and long standing not to be thought of. Queen Elizabeth, as is well known, was also a maiden Queen, but was Queen Victoria's senior by several years. The sister of Queen Anne was also Queen Regnant; but she had been crowned with her husband, to whom she had surrendered her rights. The husband of Queen Anne did not participate in the ceremonial.

It was impossible, therefore, that the chief object in a coronation could excite deeper interest than in this instance; and it was hoped that everything would be done to render this most imposing of State ceremonies at once worthy of the Sovereign and of the nation. The economical views that had prevailed when William and Adelaide were crowned were in some degree excused in consequence of the age of the King and Queen; but the circumstances under which their successor would come before her people to receive her dignities were so entirely different, that it was hoped the affair would be conducted in a manner characteristic of a nation that desired to be regarded as one of the wealthiest and most powerful in Europe.

But the Government still appeared to stand in some awe of "the strictest economy" principle, in reference to so large an expenditure as the customary pageant must entail, if conducted in the style of 1820; though, to swell the pomp of a colleague when sent on a colonial mission, they had not scrupled to indulge in lavish expenses. They had, too, only just announced a large deficit in the Exchequer, and a vast increase in the public expenditure, therefore they could not sanction an entire coronation. The people and the Queen must be content with an abbreviated ceremony, in as cheap a form as it could be executed consistent with their estimate of the dignity of their Queen.

To reconcile the public to such an arrangement,

Lord Fitzwilliam, in the House of Lords, is reported to have made a speech, in which the uselessness of this grand alliance between Sovereign and people was insisted on, while it was stigmatized as only fit for a barbarous age. It is but justice to the assembly his lordship addressed to add, that he stood alone in his opinion.

There is no doubt that the coronation of the last Queen Regnant ought to have been taken as a precedent, and that it should have been brought by Lord Melbourne under the observation of his Royal mistress; but this he appears to have overlooked. That he went so far as to repeat Lord Fitzwilliam's declaration we do not believe, though he persuaded her Majesty to sanction some important omissions in the ceremonial, such as the walking procession of all the estates of the realm, the banquet in Westminster Hall, with the feudal services—time-honoured rights that ought not lightly to have been set aside.

These rare pageants, when properly conducted, afford an extraordinary impulse to trade, and would have given employment to many branches of industry; but the Minister turned a deaf ear to all representations either of right or of policy, and the British Empire was condemned to stand in the eyes of foreigners as too poor to crown her Monarch with the state which, when much poorer, the nation had willingly afforded.

Such niggardliness, however, was insisted on

only within certain limits. By all other classes of the Queen's subjects preparations were liberally made to do honour to the occasion, and as the 28th of June approached, the public interest in the subject increased rapidly. In deference to this, some extension was made in the arrangements for the preliminary cavalcade. So eager were the public to witness the ceremony to advantage, that the speculation in seats at the windows or scaffolds before the houses on the line of route became very animated. Several in St. James's-street were let for the day for 200*l.* each, as well as one in Pall-Mall that had been occupied as the Reform Club House; and sittings ranged from ten shillings to five guineas.

A similar liberality prevailed among persons of distinction to appear with becoming splendour. Marshal Soult, who had been sent as ambassador from the King of the French, brought over with him the frame of a state carriage that had been used by the Prince of Condé, and had it redecorated in the most costly manner possible. A similar vehicle that had been built for the Duke of Devonshire, when he went on his Extraordinary Embassy to St. Petersburg, at a cost of 3000*l.*, was purchased by the Russian Ambassador, Count Strogonoff, for 1600*l.* Another diplomatist gave 250*l.* for the hire of a carriage for the day; and some had to be content with vehicles that had already ministered to the state of our civic

functionaries, time only permitting of hasty alterations from the coach-painter.

The number of spectators was unusually great, and everywhere they testified their interest in a spectacle that had been pronounced unworthy of any attention in an age of reform. The procession having been formed near Buckingham Palace, started at ten o'clock in the morning, preceded by trumpeters and a squadron of the household brigade, the foreign resident ministers, then the foreign ambassadors extraordinary, and the resident foreign ambassadors were followed by a mounted regimental band and a detachment of the household brigade; then came the carriages of the Duchesses of Kent and Gloucester, the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge, and the Duke of Sussex.

Another mounted band, and the Queen's bargemaster with forty-eight watermen, preceded twelve of the Queen's carriages conveying the ladies, noblemen, and gentlemen belonging to the royal household, followed by a squadron of the household brigade and another mounted band. After them came the military staff, aides-de-camp, and other distinguished officers, mounted; the royal huntsmen, yeomen prickers, and foresters, six of her Majesty's led horses, with the exons, yeomen of the guard, and their officers.

Then came the Queen in her state carriage, drawn by eight cream-coloured horses, followed by the Duke of Buccleugh on horseback as Captain-General

of the Royal Archer Guard of Scotland, with a few minor officials, and a squadron of the household brigade closed the procession. It proceeded along Constitution-hill, Piccadilly, down St. James's-street, through Pall-Mall, Cockspur-street, Charing-Cross, Whitehall, and Parliament-street, to the west door of Westminster Abbey.

The interior of the ancient edifice was fitted up with more taste than in 1831. A gallery had been raised capable of containing four hundred persons, and an orchestra with a temporary organ at the west end of the choir on an open colonnade of pointed arches. Another gallery at the east end, beyond the altar, for six hundred persons, was reserved for the House of Commons; below which, within St. Edward's Chapel, were the Queen's traverse and the retiring closets, and above were two galleries, one above another, the topmost for the trumpeters.

Above the sacrarium, on the south, were boxes for the Sovereign, the Earl Marshal, for the ambassadors, and for the Lord Chamberlain. The peeresses were placed in the north transept, the peers in the south, the judges, Knights of the Bath, aldermen, &c., in the choir, the bishops on the floor to the north, with the Royal family and prebendaries of Westminster opposite. The latter waited in the nave to join the procession on entering the Abbey, and the Princesses Augusta and Augusta of Cambridge, Prince George of Cambridge,

the Duke of Nemours, the Prince of Holstein-Glucksbourg, the Duke of Saxe-Coburg, the Duke of Nassau, Prince Ernest of Hesse, and the Prince of Leiningen were accommodated with seats in the royal box.

The prebendaries now headed the procession, followed by the heralds, the officers of the household, the chief prelates and officers of state. Then came the Duchess of Cambridge with a circlet of gold on her head, wearing a robe of estate of purple velvet, her train borne by Lady Caroline Campbell, her coronet by Viscount Villiers; the Duchess of Kent with a similar circlet and robe, her train borne by Lady Flora Hastings, her coronet by Viscount Morpeth; and the Duchess of Gloucester, her train borne by Lady Caroline Legge, her coronet by Viscount Evelyn.

The Regalia was thus divided: St. Edward's staff was carried by the Duke of Roxburgh, the golden spurs by Lord Byron, the sceptre with the cross by the Duke of Cleveland, the third sword by the Marquis of Westminster, the curtana by the Duke of Devonshire, and the second sword by the Duke of Sutherland. The coronets of these noblemen were carried by pages.

After the Black Rod, the Deputy Garter, and the Lord Great Chamberlain of England, came the Duke of Cambridge in his robes of estate, with his bâton of Field Marshal, his coronet borne by the Marquis of Granby, his train by Major-General Sir William

Maynard Gomm; and the Duke of Sussex in his robes of estate, his coronet borne by Viscount Anson, his train by the Hon. Edward Gore and Viscount Coke.

Then came the Duke of Leinster as High Constable of Ireland, and the Earl of Erroll as High Constable of Scotland, the Duke of Norfolk as Earl Marshal with his bâton, and the Duke of Wellington as Lord High Constable of England with his staff and Field Marshal's bâton. The Sword of State was borne by Viscount Melbourne, the sceptre with the dove by the Duke of Richmond, St. Edward's crown by the Duke of Hamilton (Lord High Steward), the orb by the Duke of Somerset, the patina by the Bishop of Bangor, the Bible by the Bishop of Winchester, and the chalice by the Bishop of Lincoln.

They preceded the Queen, who wore a royal robe of crimson velvet furred with ermine and bordered with gold lace, the collars of the Orders of the Garter, Thistle, Bath, and St. Patrick, and a circlet of gold. Her Majesty was supported on either side by the Bishops of Bath and Wells and Durham; her train was borne by Ladies Adelaide Paget, Frances Elizabeth Cowper, Anne Wentworth Fitzwilliam, Mary Augusta Frederica Grimstone, Caroline Amelia Gordon Lennox, Mary Alethea Beatrix Talbot, Catherine Lucy Wilhelmina Stanhope, and Louisa Harriet Jenkinson, assisted by the Lord Chamberlain of the Household, the Marquis

Conyngham, followed by the Groom of the Robes, Captain Francis Seymour, with ten Gentlemen-at-Arms on either side, with their Lieutenant Standard-bearer, Clerk of the Cheque, and Harbinger.

Afterwards came the Duchess of Sutherland as Mistress of the Robes, the Marchioness of Lansdowne as First Lady of the Bedchamber; the other Ladies of the Bedchamber, the Marchionesses of Normanby and Tavistock, the Countess of Charlemont, and the Ladies Lyttelton, Barham, and Portman. The Maids of Honour, the Honourable Margaret Dillon, Harriet Pitt, Caroline Cocks, Matilda Paget, and Misses Murray, Cavendish, Spring Rice, and Lister. The Women of the Bedchamber, Viscountess Forbes, Ladies Theresa Digby, Harriet Clive, Caroline Barrington, Charlotte Copley, and Gardiner, and the Honourable Mesdames Campbell and Brand.

They were followed by the Gold Stick of the Life Guards, Viscount Combermere; the Master of the Horse, the Earl of Albemarle; the Captain-General of the Royal Archer Guard of Scotland, the Duke of Buccleugh; and the Captains of the Yeomen of the Guard, the Earl of Ilchester, and of the Band of Gentlemen-at-Arms, Lord Foley; by the Lords in Waiting, the Marquis of Headfort, the Earls of Fingall and Uxbridge, the Viscounts Falkland and Torrington, and Lords Selford and Gardner; and by the Keeper of Her Majesty's Privy Purse, Major-General Sir H. Wheatley.

The Exons and Yeomen of the Guard brought up the rear.

As the ceremony did not differ materially from the one already described, we shall merely add that the act of homage was performed by the Spiritual Lords kneeling around the Queen, pronouncing the words of homage, and kissing her Majesty's hand. The Princes of the Blood Royal ascended the steps of the throne, took off their coronets, knelt, pronounced the words of homage, touched the crown upon her Majesty's head, and kissed her left cheek.

The Duke of Norfolk and sixteen other dukes present did the same, with the exception of kissing the hand instead of the cheek; and their example was followed by the Marquis of Huntley and twenty-one marquises, by the Earl of Shrewsbury and ninety-three earls, by Viscount Hereford and nineteen viscounts, and by Lord Audley and ninety-one barons.

Lord Rolle, who was very infirm, on ascending the throne, slipped, when the Queen rose and extended her hand, expressing a hope that he was not hurt. The Duke of Wellington was much cheered when performing his homage; and when this part of the ceremony was concluded, the members of the House of Commons gave nine hearty cheers, accompanied with frequent cries of "God save Queen Victoria!" which were repeated throughout the building. The peers present were in number 245, the peeresses 158; a much

larger proportion than attended the coronation of William IV.

The crown made for George IV. weighed upwards of seven pounds, and having been considered too heavy for the Queen, a new one was constructed for this occasion by Messrs. Rundell and Bridge of less than half the weight, formed of hoops of silver, covered with precious stones, over a cap of rich blue velvet, surmounted by a ball enriched with small diamonds, having on the top a Maltese cross of brilliants, a splendid sapphire in the centre, a cluster of brilliants, with fleurs-de-lis and Maltese crosses round the centre of the crown, ornamented, and the large heart-shaped ruby worn by the Black Prince in front, a large oblong sapphire below it, and clusters of drop pearls, with emeralds, rubies, sapphires and other gems.

After the ceremony, her Majesty entertained at the palace a dinner party of one hundred persons as a substitute for the grand banquet that should have been given in Westminster Hall, with the chivalrous ceremony of the Queen's champion and other ancient usages that had never been omitted before the reform era. The Duke of Wellington gave a grand ball at Apsley House, to which two thousand persons received cards of invitation. The Cabinet Ministers gave State dinners. Illuminations, fireworks, a fair in Hyde Park, and free admission to the theatres, were provided for the gratification of her Majesty's subjects in and about

the metropolis, who appeared to enjoy them with the greatest zest and with the most loyal spirit. Although immense multitudes were collected in every direction, there was not the slightest disturbance, and the only accident that occurred was occasioned by the descent of a balloon.

On the 30th of June, much opposition was made in the Commons to a Bill that had been brought in to abolish the holding of vestries in churches—a custom that had lasted for six centuries—and for making other parochial changes. Lord John Russell made an apology for the inconvenience the measure was likely to occasion in Parliament; but on a division to re-commit it, the Bill was carried by a majority of seventy-one.

On July 6th, in a very small house, Mr. Dillon moved, "that a humble address be presented to her Majesty, praying that she would take into her gracious consideration the parliamentary allowance hitherto and at present enjoyed by his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex, as compared with those enjoyed by the other members of the Royal Family, with a view to recommend some addition to it." He then stated that the Duke's income was 6000*l.* less than that provided for other members of his family similarly circumstanced, and that his Royal Highness was at the head of seventy scientific and literary bodies and charitable institutions. Lord John Russell opposed the motion, on the ground that it could only originate in a message

from the Sovereign. Sir Robert Peel took the same view of the question. On a division, there were forty-eight for the motion and twenty-eight against it.

In a Committee of Supply, among other grants, the House voted 70,000*l.* on account of the coronation, 74,586*l.* to defray the expense of the royal palaces, and 100,000*l.* towards the erection of the new Houses of Parliament.

On the 9th, the third reading of the Irish Poor Law Bill in the Lords elicited strenuous opposition from the Marquises of Londonderry and Clanricarde, the Earls Mountcashel and Limerick, Lord Brougham and Lord Plunkett. Nevertheless, with the Duke of Wellington's assistance, it passed with a majority of sixty-two. Ministers obtained the same majority in the House of Commons on the 11th, on the second reading of the Parochial Assessments Bill.

Lord Melbourne, on the 12th, in the House of Lords, moved the committal of the Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Bill. Lord Lyndhurst, after a powerful speech in opposition to the measure, moved some important amendments, which were carried against the Government by a majority of sixty.

The visit of Marshal Soult to this country excited much popular feeling in his favour. His presence appeared to be a great attraction, not only to military officers, who took a professional interest

in seeing one of the ablest of Napoleon's generals, but to the populace, who were equally attracted towards the last and most skilful of the Duke of Wellington's opponents in the Peninsula. Reviews were got up for his entertainment, and every attention paid that could help to make his sojourn in England agreeable to him. There was a review in Hyde Park, on the 9th, of about five thousand men—a small force compared with the spectacles of the same nature that were frequently exhibited to the Parisians; but it was composed of some of the best regiments in the British service. In cavalry, these comprised the 1st and 2nd Life Guards, the Royal Horse Guards, the 10th Hussars, and the 12th Lancers; in infantry, the 1st and 3rd battalions of the Grenadier Guards, the 1st and 2nd of the Scotch Fusiliers; the same of the Rifle Brigade; in artillery, three troops of the Royal Horse, having two guns each; and three batteries of Field Artillery.

When her Majesty, with a numerous suite, appeared on the ground, each regiment marched past her in slow time, the cavalry in close column, the infantry at quarter distance, after which the evolutions of a battle were performed; finally, both lines advanced in parade order, and saluted. It was computed that at least 150,000 persons were present as spectators. Marshal Soult had scarcely entered the park when his stirrup broke, and on sending for another to the saddlers to the Ordnance,

they forwarded a pair that had been used by the Emperor Napoleon.

On the 13th, the Corporation of the City of London entertained the foreign ambassadors and other illustrious guests with a state banquet at Guildhall. Six hundred sat down to dinner. The names of Marshal Soult and the Duke of Wellington, who were present, were joined in a toast, and the compliment acknowledged by both with equal frankness and cordiality.

The coronation caused several additions to be made to the English peerage, many with titles previously enjoyed in those of Ireland and Scotland. The Earl of Mulgrave was created Marquis of Normanby; Baron King, Viscount Ockham and Earl of Lovelace; Baron Dundas, Earl of Zetland; Earl of Kintore, Baron Kintore; Viscount Lismore, Baron Lismore; Baron Rossmore, Baron Rossmore; Baron Carew, Baron Carew; the Honourable William Francis Ponsonby, Baron de Mauley; Sir John Wrottesley, Baron Wrottesley; Charles Hanbury Tracey, Baron Sudeley; Paul Methuen Baron Methuen, Baron Methuen; Marquis of Carmarthen, Baron Osborne; Earl Bruce, Baron Bruce.

Twenty-nine baronets were created, among whom were George Earle Lytton Bulwer and John Frederick William Herschel, who ably represented the claims of literature and science. Knighthood was also liberally conferred, and there were extensive promotions in every branch of the Queen's

naval and military service, as well as in that of the East India Company.

On the 23rd of July, the Benefices and Pluralities Bill passed its third reading in the House of Lords. On the 26th, the Lord Chancellor moved the order of the day for the third reading of the Church Discipline Bill, which was energetically attacked by the Bishop of Exeter. Lord Brougham opposed it, and the Duke of Wellington recommended its postponement; and though the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Lincoln defended the Bill, it was withdrawn. On the same day, in the Commons, the Irish Tithe Bill was read a third time. An attempt made by Mr. Dillon to defeat it was only supported by thirty votes; and Sir Robert Peel having expressed an opinion in its favour, it was carried by a majority of 118.

On the 27th, there was an animated discussion in the Lords on the third reading of the Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Bill; but the measure was passed without a division. On the 30th, the Custody of Infants Bill was rejected by a majority of two. On the 2nd of August, Lord John Russell brought under the consideration of the Commons the Lords' amendments on the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill. Propositions he made respecting them led to some debate, and produced two divisions; but they were in favour of the Government—one by a majority of eight, the other by fifteen.

The Irish Tithes Bill went into Committee in the

Lords on the following day, when Lord Fitzgerald and Vesci moved as an amendment that the thirteenth clause be omitted. This was carried by a majority of thirty-nine. The remaining clauses were then agreed to. On the 7th, the House took into consideration the proposed alterations by the Commons of their amendments of the Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Bill, and observing the very small majorities by which they had been carried, they were rejected by a division of 144 to 67, the 10*l.* qualification insisted upon, and the clauses relating to the administration of charitable trusts, and other provisions which had been struck out by the Commons, were re-introduced without any division.

Two conferences on the subject were held between the two Houses; but the Lords insisting on their alterations, Lord John Russell, on the 9th, thought it most prudent to get rid of the affair by moving that the Lords' amendments be taken into consideration that day three months. Mr. O'Connell having ventured upon some remarks respecting the insult to the people of Ireland, the proposition was adopted.

There can be little question that both Whigs and Repealers were extremely indignant at this checkmate to their designs in Ireland; for the steady opposition of the House of Peers not only prevented an arrangement by which both expected largely to profit, but showed to the country their powerless-

ness in the Legislature. Their fluctuating majorities in the House of Commons warned them against pushing the dispute further; and the absence of anything like sympathy for them among the people of England was equally significant of danger to the Government. The safe course, therefore, lay in backing out of the quarrel as expeditiously as possible.

The same day, in the House of Lords, Lord Brougham moved the second reading of a Bill for declaring the true meaning of an Act recently passed, entitled, "An Act to make temporary Provision for the Government of Lower Canada," stating that an ordinance which had been issued by Lord Durham under its authority was illegal. Lord Glenelg opposed the Bill, though he condemned the ordinance. Lord Lyndhurst more forcibly inveighed against the proceedings of the Canadian Government. Lord Melbourne admitted the illegality of sentencing offenders to banishment to Bermuda, but appeared to think it excusable, as Lord Durham had been furnished by all parties in the House with extraordinary powers.

The Duke of Wellington rose and complained of the censure conveyed in the speech of Lord Melbourne, stating that, though he had been willing to strengthen the Government to enable it more effectually to deal with Canada, he denied that he or any of his friends was responsible for the subsequent proceedings of the Canadian Government,

and denounced the idea of this country permitting banishment without trial. There was a division, when the question was carried against the Government by a majority of eighteen.

This debate served to bring prominently into view the illiberality of ultra-Liberals, and despotic tendency of the advocates of liberty when invested with authority over their fellow-men.

In a debate on the same subject that occurred in the House of Commons on the 14th, Lord John Russell, while he acknowledged that it was the intention of the Government to acquiesce in the Bill respecting Canada that had come from the Lords, made a laboured apology for Lord Durham. He, however, met with no support either from the Conservatives, the Radicals, or the Repealers.

Sir William Follett said that Lord Durham had not been entrusted with power to decide on the guilt of accused men without jury, witnesses, or defence, and on his own finding to banish, to imprison, and to execute. In short, though one or two of the Ministers strove to excuse their colleague, the opinion of the House was so strongly expressed that Lord John Russell wisely evaded a division.[1]

On the 15th, the Government succeeded in effecting a triumph in the House of Lords. The third reading of the Cornwall Tin Duties Bill, though opposed by the Duke of Wellington and Lord

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

Lyndhurst, was carried by a majority of *one* in a very small house of little more than fifty peers. With this success Ministers were forced to be content; for on the following day her Majesty prorogued Parliament in person, with a speech that referred to the continuance of the civil war in Spain, the suppression of the rebellion in Canada, and the prospective abolition of Negro apprenticeship in the British colonies. It expressed satisfaction with amendments that had been made in the domestic institutions of the country, and hoped that the mitigation of the law of imprisonment for debt would be favourable to the liberty of the subject and safe for commercial credit, and that the Established Church would derive increased efficiency from being restricted in granting benefices in plurality. Similar anticipations were expressed in favour of the Bills for the relief of the poor and for the composition of tithes in Ireland. Thanks were then given for the allowances and supplies.

Thus the session had been gone through, and Ministers remained in their places, notwithstanding repeated defeats in the House of Lords, the consequent humiliating acknowledgment of their inability to carry out their measures, and the stern censure that had been passed upon their colonial policy. The impression of their general inefficiency was evidently strengthening, and the true character of the Reform agitation daily becoming better known. But its mischievous tendency was only

beginning to be understood, as one of a more democratic character commenced its development. This made itself manifest in the summer of this year in the great manufacturing towns under the since well-known name of Chartism.

A public meeting was held near Birmingham, with Mr. Thomas Attwood in the chair, on the 6th of August, when a petition was agreed to be presented to the House of Commons, which, among other paragraphs, contained this:—

"May it therefore please your Honourable House to use your utmost endeavours, by all constitutional means, to have a law passed, granting to every male of lawful age, sane mind, and unconvicted of any crime, the right of voting for members of Parliament, and directing all future elections for members of Parliament to be in the way of secret ballot; ordaining that the duration of Parliaments so chosen shall in no case exceed one year; abolishing all property qualifications in the members, and providing for their due remuneration whilst in attendance on their parliamentary duties."[1]

These proposals, to be sure, were old acquaintances, but they were now brought forward by the influence of certain Radical leaders of the industrious classes, a few of whom were manufacturers. The lesson they were now teaching, those under their employ learnt readily, and in a short time were able to employ it against their instructors, when they urged

[1] *Annual Register.*

the claims of labour against the influence of capital. The master was only desirous of securing parliamentary honours and advantages for his own class; but the servant saw in universal suffrage and in the ballot-box means of raising wages and lessening labour; while annual parliaments would afford a regular income to those who had the wit to combine for making the most of their votes, and the abolition of the property qualification would secure to them the return of a candidate pledged to forward their interests and advocate their views.

Mr. Attwood played in 1838 somewhat the same game that Mr. Bright is now repeating—denouncing the class above him to those below him, ostensibly to forward what he considered popular interests, but not without an eye to his own. With such men popularity is regarded as power; and even if they entertain no ambitious thoughts, they are not insensible to the kind of elevation and the political consequence it affords. The professors of the Birmingham school, like their Manchester followers, found apt scholars; but utilitarianism may be looked upon from different, indeed from opposite, points of view by teachers and pupils.

Birmingham, however, was not the British empire, nor was it the fairest part of it; nor was its population the wisest part of her people. There was nothing in its position to warrant its claiming to be considered to England what Paris is to France.

The same may be said of Manchester. And however prominently its leaders may put themselves forward as amateur legislators, it cannot be forgotten that the Russian war found them something worse than useless, and left them thoroughly insignificant —a result that might have been expected where men of business, whose thoughts, calculations, and hopes have always run in a particular channel, want to direct one of the greatest of modern governments by a system that is only adapted to a third-rate commercial enterprise.

England has a high position to maintain, and must maintain it, or fall. If other governments choose to multiply their warlike resources, to remain unable to cope with them is to invite subjection; if neighbouring states threaten attack, to preach peace is to insure ruin. Our most sagacious statesmen, our most daring and skilful commanders by sea and land, have combined, at an enormous cost of blood and treasure, to make the British empire a power in the world capable of effecting more for the advancement of human intelligence and virtue than has been at any time within the compass of any other state. This distinction and its responsibilities are not to be set aside by either Birmingham or Manchester policy. We entertain great respect for their manufacturing skill, and admire their industry and ingenuity; but statesmanship is a totally different talent, and we can place our confidence only in those

who have given unquestionable evidence that they possess it.

On the 4th of September the King and Queen of the Belgians paid a visit to this country. They landed at Ramsgate after a favourable voyage across the Channel, and were received by the Belgian Minister (M. Van de Weyer), the Duke of Wellington, and Lord Torrington. The latter conducted them to the Queen at Windsor Castle, where they remained her Majesty's guests. On the 18th there was a review in Windsor Little Park, when the Queen appeared on horseback in the Windsor uniform, wearing the badge and ribbon of the Order of the Garter. King Leopold, in a Field Marshal's uniform, rode on her right, and Lord Hill, Commander of the Forces, on her left hand, followed by the Duke of Wellington and Lord Palmerston. The King and Queen of the Belgians left the Castle on the 20th, and on the following morning re-embarked for Ostend, carrying with them agreeable impressions of their English tour.

Lord Durham, when he received information of the parliamentary proceedings in which his name and acts had figured so prominently, was exceedingly displeased, particularly with the Ministers, for not having afforded him, when attacked, a more cordial support. He soon left Canada. Although this was no very great loss to the colony, it was followed by serious consequences, for the snake of rebellion had been scotched, not killed; and the disaffected,

noticing the inefficiency of the Home Government, made another experiment at a revolution, in which they relied for important assistance from persons residing within the American frontier.

The rebellion commenced about the beginning of November in the Lower Province, in the sub-districts of Beauharnois, Chateauguay, and Acadia, the latter one of the old French settlements in the western angle formed by the confluence of the Rivers Richelieu and the St. Lawrence, familiar to the reader as the scene of Longfellow's poetical romance, "Evangeline." On the 3rd, the rebels in arms made an attempt to seize a steamer that had carried artillery from Montreal. This failed; and they then took possession of the town of La Prairie, compelling the inhabitants to transport themselves to the capital. On the following day they attacked Beauharnois, which, after a spirited defence, they captured, taking prisoner Mr. Ellice (a nephew of Earl Grey), his lady, and sister, and several persons of respectability, who were forwarded, for safe keeping, to Chateauguay.

They now established their head-quarters at Napierville, with a well-armed force of 8000 men; and fancying themselves masters of the country, for several days enjoyed themselves in the town, apparently very much at their ease. But an energetic and skilful commander was quietly taking his measures for the safety of the colony. Sir John Colborne proclaimed martial law on the 4th, on

which day a tribe of loyal Indians attacked and defeated a body of the rebels, taking seventy-five prisoners.

The sympathizers within the United States frontier had not been inactive. They made sure that the time had come for incorporating Canada with the United States, and with their usual extreme confidence in themselves expected an easy conquest; but Colonel Taylor, at the head of only 200 British settlers, met a force nearly five times as strong, which the Americans had joined. They were proceeding under Dr. Nelson, one of the leaders of the last movement, to reinforce the main body, but were defeated at Odelton, within sight of the frontier—a particular convenience to some of the fugitives.

On the 9th, the rebel army thought it prudent to quit Napierville. On the 10th and 11th, the loyalists attacked and retook Beauharnois and La Prairie. Sir John Colborne concentrated his troops on the following day at the late head-quarters of the rebels, and inflicted a summary vengeance on the entire district. This severity cowed the conspirators in all directions; and the general was congratulating himself on a speedy end to the war, when a large body of American sympathizers, 800 strong, embarked fully armed, and with several pieces of artillery, in two schooners at Ogdenburgh; for the invasion of Upper Canada. They first attacked the opposite town of Prescott. They failed, however,

to effect a landing; but with the assistance of two United States steamers disembarked about a couple of miles below the town. Here they took up a strong position at a windmill and in some stone buildings, where they were enabled to repel, with some loss, a hasty attempt to dislodge them.

On the 15th, however, Colonel Dundas arrived with a reinforcement of regular troops and three pieces of artillery. Captain Sandon, with two gun-boats, aided in attacking the position from the water; and in about half-an-hour after opening fire the filibusters surrendered at discretion. On examination, they proved a motley assemblage of nations, the bulk being Yankee adventurers. Of these, the commander, Colonel von Shoultz, a Pole, was hanged at Kingston on the 8th of December; and Dorephus Abbey, a printer, with Daniel George and Charles Smith, his subordinates, on the following week.

Another invasion was attempted on the 4th of December, from Detroit. About 400 persons effected a landing at Windsor, three miles above Sandwich, where they set fire to a steamboat, burnt down the barracks, shot the sentry, suffered two militia men to be consumed in the flames, and in the most cowardly manner, with axes and bowie-knives, murdered an unarmed assistant-surgeon, who accidentally fell into their hands.[1] These atrocities, however, were speedily avenged. The militia from

[1] *Annual Register.*

Sandwich were soon on the spot; they attacked the ruffians, killed many, took some prisoners, and the rest fled—some to Hog Island, on the American side, where they were safe from pursuit; the rest to the neighbouring woods, where they were hunted and captured.

Sir John Colborne was appointed Governor-General of the colony, and invested with the same powers that had been granted to Lord Durham. This officer proved himself as sagacious as he was skilful and energetic. The rebellion ceased in Canada; and though menacing demonstrations were made on the American frontier, the fate of their countrymen, and the preparations for their reception, daunted the sympathizers for a time. Nevertheless, they received so much countenance, especially from the authorities of the State of Maine, that a collision seemed imminent in New Brunswick. Although this state of things kept the colony for some months in a kind of ferment, and acts of an unjustifiable nature were perpetrated by the Americans, there was no war. The effervescence gradually subsided, and the previous state of feeling was restored on both sides the frontier.

The rebellion effected results which those who planned it had not anticipated. It proved undeniably that the colony was loyal at heart, and that disaffection had been confined to the old French settlement of Acadia, where a sense of hostility to

British rule had been carefully nurtured, founded on exaggerated statements of evils inflicted on the inhabitants soon after it became a British possession. No people could have done more to show their appreciation of the Government under which they had settled and prospered than the English colonists; and to the valour and energy of their leaders, under the direction of Sir John Colborne, we owe our continued possession of that valuable portion of the North American continent remaining of the vast settlements originally peopled and cultivated by England.

The Whigs congratulated themselves on this result, though they ignored their participation in its cause; but it must be acknowledged that extraordinary good fortune attended their repressive policy, of which, somehow or other, they have contrived to obtain great experience. Indeed, with intervals of intermission, something of the kind had been constantly demanded since the passing of the Reform Bill. It was either directed against the agricultural labourer in England to repress agrarian disturbance, or against the repealing peasantry of Ireland, to put down their anti-tithe or rather anti-Protestant combinations; and to keep their hand in they assisted in the civil wars of other countries.

In rebellions, besides Canada, they have had one on a small scale in Ireland, and one on a very large one in India. They have all been effectually re-

pressed; but the Government would have established much higher claims on the gratitude of the country, saved thousands of valuable lives, and incalculable treasure, if they had been avoided. Reform sentiments, like the thistle down, will float about in the air unheeded, no one knowing where it will germinate; but they are sure to alight somewhere where the soil is favourable to their growth. When great people announced that political changes were necessary, it was not to be wondered at that little people in time should come to the same conclusion with totally different objects in view; the tendency to imitation contributing something to this, the desire of profiting by it a good deal more.

What we had been doing in Portugal and Spain we repeated in Affghanistan—meddling in quarrels of disputed succession. Here, however, we forced upon a warlike people, jealous of foreign interference, a prince extremely disliked by his countrymen, and totally unfit to rule over them. The preparations that were being made in India to support the claims of Shah Shuja attracted general attention; the following communication on the subject will be found worthy of attention.

SIR GORE OUSELEY, BART., TO THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

Hall Barn Park, Beaconsfield, Nov. 8, 1838.

My dear Lord Duke,

No common rule of reasoning will apply to the Ministry now in power, otherwise one might calculate that the Canada business and Lord Durham's proclamation must be their death blow. As to the latter document, I have some notion that it has sufficient in it to warrant *an impeachment*. But as you wish my opinion on our Eastern affairs, in which I am perhaps less ignorant than in Canadian politics and their consequences, I shall at once proceed to this interesting subject, premising that I know nothing more than what I have read in the newspapers.

In the first place, then, I entirely approve of the step taken by Lord Auckland to protect India BEYOND our own frontiers, although I feel certain that the carrying out such a measure is pregnant with almost insurmountable difficulties. The progress of the Russians in their hitherto well-concealed intention of invading India, and obtaining as allies as many of the neighbouring states as they can cajole or coerce to their purpose, cannot now be either doubted or denied; and although I feel some confidence that we should be able to beat them even within our own frontiers, yet it might be attended with great risk and a vast expenditure of blood and treasure. Besides, our conduct to many of the native Princes (now quiet vassals) might probably induce many insurrections on several distant points of our too extended empire, when they saw a prospect of our troops being concentrated in one direction by an invading Russian army. This is not begging the question, or a surmise without a precedent, as attempts

were made; although quickly crushed, in Lord Wellesley's time, on a menaced invasion from the same quarter, by the Afghans under Zeman Shah, and again by the Burmese and Nepalese, when Lord Moira was taking the field against the Marhattas.

From a retrospect of past occurrences, I think it will strike your Grace, as it does me, that some check should be applied to the approaches of the Russians before they arrive at a point when it may be difficult, if not impossible, to stop them without imminent danger to our existence as the paramount power of India. Had the Shah of Persia succeeded at Herat and continued faithful to Russia, the most difficult part of the march to India would have been rendered perfectly practicable to a Russian army. Cabul and Kandahar would have followed the fall of Herat, and Russia could march to Attock on the Indus without impediment. Ranjit Singh, with his 50 or 60,000 Sikhs, now our friend and ally, would then be the only power between us and the invaders, and it is not at all improbable that fear or bribery, or both, might make him the friend of Russia against us. He is besides a very old *moribonde*, and we are not in any way sure of the next heir being our friend, should the old man even continue faithful to us.

Under such circumstances, our best plan would be to defend our Indian frontier on the western side of the Indus, giving assistance and heart to the Afghans of Herat, Cabul, and Kandahar against Russia and Persia. This is probably Lord Auckland's intention; but the execution of the measure is most difficult, for, alas! the possessors of the above three cities and their dependant territories are at variance amongst themselves. According to the papers, the Indian army is to take Shah Shujaa (at present a

refugee in our camp) with them, and reseat him on the throne from which he was expelled, I believe, for cruelty. His elder brother also, Zeman Shah, now old and blind, has been for some time in our hands as a refugee. I know not if he is passed over from his blindness or other causes; but since the expulsion of him and Shujaa, there have been two other brothers ephemeral kings—Ayub and Muhammed Shah—fighting against each other and against one of their ministers, Dúst Muhammed Khan, who has set up for himself and holds the power of the State at Cabul without the title of king. Again, Kamrán Mirza, the son of Muhammed Shah, and nephew of Shah Shujaa, holds Herat, and deserves to hold it after his brave defence of it against the Shah of Persia assisted by the Russian Minister and engineers. You will allow that *componere lites* here is rather difficult, and the suspicion of our policy respecting the restoration of Shujaa at the expence of the brave Kamrán and Dúst Muhammed Khan may greatly obstruct our entrance into Afghanistán. Should we, however, succeed in reconciling the parties now in possession to yield the paramount power to our *protégé* Shujaa, and that we place a strong subsidiary force with him, we are safe from Russia, I trust, for ever.

Conjointly with the above operations, Persia should be *sickened* of her alliance with Russia, which might be easily effected now that the King has been foiled at Herat, to attack which he opposed our counsel and followed that of Russia, given for their own views and ends, and is disgraced in consequence of his abortive attempt.

I fear I have tired your patience; but it was necessary to be prolix to put you *au fait* of the various interests that must be drawn together before we can consider India safe from invasion.

I do not think it will be necessary to go to war with Russia for our Indian affairs. She is only following up a long-meditated plan, and I do not blame her for doing so, particularly when the supineness of our statesmen for the last twenty years has encouraged them to proceed unchecked; but what our policy at Constantinople may effect, it is impossible for me to speculate upon with such slender information as I possess, but it looks warlike.

Excuse this hurried scrawl, as I write in haste, and with many voices at work near me.

Believe me, my dear Lord Duke,
Yours faithful and attached,
GORE OUSELEY.

Scarcely had the order of the Dooranee Empire been distributed, which was founded in commemoration of the great settlement in favour of our illustrious ally Shuja, when there occurred the massacre at Cabul and the flight of the English survivors from the entire country. It is well known that we signally avenged these disasters, though we wisely surrendered Affghanistan to Dost Mahomet—his rival and his pretensions having entirely disappeared — but the scenes of our terrible retreat created an impression against us throughout India that not even our subsequent brilliant conquests of the countries of Runjeet Singh and of Scinde could remove; and the recent Sepoy rebellion was the consequence.

With regard to the participation of Russia in these native intrigues, there can be little doubt that

they were well known at St. Petersburgh; for while we were thus occupied against different states on our frontier, Russia was quietly enclosing in a circle of forts, and in other ways obtaining immense acquisitions in Central Asia, gradually, but surely, incorporating the entire region lying between Oriental Siberia and the Himalayas, which, with the recent territory obtained from China on the Upper and Lower Amoor, form an addition to her enormous empire greater than the area of Europe.[1] Her steady perseverance in pushing her approaches towards our Indian frontier, and concentrating her warlike resources at convenient points, appears to have quite escaped the observation of our Governments.

[1] See Mr. Atkinson's interesting work describing these regions.

CHAPTER XIV.

[1839.]

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH—MR. THOMAS DUNCOMBE AND THE CHARTIST DELEGATES — DEBATES ON THE CORN LAWS IN BOTH HOUSES — MR. HUME AND HIS NEW REFORM BILL—GOVERNMENT DEFEATED IN THE HOUSE OF PEERS —DEBATE ON LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S MOTION IN THE COMMONS OF CONFIDENCE IN MINISTERS, AND ON THE JAMAICA BILL—RESIGNATION OF THE GOVERNMENT — THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON CONSULTED BY THE QUEEN — SIR ROBERT PEEL SENT FOR—ARRANGEMENTS FOR A NEW ADMINISTRATION COMPLETED—THE QUEEN ADVISED BY HER LATE MINISTERS NOT TO PART WITH THE LADIES OF THE HOUSEHOLD — COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN HER MAJESTY AND SIR ROBERT PEEL—THE WHIG GOVERNMENT RESUME OFFICE — CURIOUS EXPLANATIONS — EXTRAORDINARY MINUTE OF THE RE-INSTATED MINISTERS IN CABINET —ALARMING CHARTIST DEMONSTRATIONS—THE EGLINTOUN TOURNAMENT—INCREASE OF DISAFFECTION IN FRANCE.

CHAPTER XIV.

The third session of her Majesty's first Parliament was opened with the customary ceremonies on the 5th of February, when the Queen delivered a speech that announced the completion of commercial treaties with the Emperor of Austria and the Sultan of Turkey, and that England, in conjunction with Austria, France, Prussia, and Russia, had entered into negotiations with a view to the final settlement of the differences between Holland and Belgium, who were reported as being favourable to the proposals of the allies. No such placable inclinations could be stated as existing in Spain, where the civil war continued with little sensible mitigation. Respecting Persia, it was intimated that, though our Minister had retired from the country, there was a prospect of our difficulties with the Shah being amicably adjusted; and the Houses were assured that preparations were being made in India to place our possessions there in a position to resist aggression "from any quarter," doubtless in allusion to Russian intrigues in that direction.

It was then stated that the reform and amendment of the municipal corporations of Ireland were essential to the interests of the Queen's dominions, and that there was an urgent necessity that Parliament should complete the measures recommended by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of the Established Church. A similar hint was given in behalf of law reform.

The gentlemen of the House of Commons were then addressed on the subject of the annual estimates, the usual reference to "the strictest economy" being modified to meet the exigencies of the public service. Assurances were given of the satisfactory working of the complete emancipation of the Negroes in the West Indies, and a statement made of the state of Canada, particularly referring to the lawless proceedings of the "sympathisers" within the United States frontier. The speech ended with the following reference to Chartist agitation:—"I have observed with pain the persevering efforts which have been made in some parts of the country to excite my subjects to disobedience and resistance to the law, and to recommend dangerous and illegal practices. For the counteraction of all such designs, I depend upon the efficacy of the law, which it will be my duty to enforce; upon the good sense and right disposition of my people; upon their attachment to the principles of justice, and their abhorrence of violence and disorder."

The address in the Lords passed without a division. In the Commons, as might have been anticipated, it was not suffered to go off so quietly. Mr. Thomas Duncombe moved an amendment, the purpose of which was to acquaint her Majesty that the Reform Bill had totally disappointed the expectations of the people, and to bind the House to take into early consideration the means of amending its numerous defects. He ventured to state that Parliament represented the aristocracy alone, and that though the middle classes made no grievance of their exclusion, the lower link in the social chain was very differently disposed. Indeed, he announced that the working men in the kingdom had absolutely appointed "delegates" to manage their claims, and that such officials were not only then in London, endeavouring to carry out the views of the persons they represented, but had in full assembly passed a resolution that the House of Commons was not worthy of being petitioned.[1]

This judgment did not appear to affect the House very much; indeed, in the course of the debate that followed, Sir Robert Peel showed how little it had touched him, by delivering a long and eloquent speech on general politics. Even Lord John Russell, who laboured under the difficulty of having to explain his policy, got through the Herculean labour in a manner that showed how perfectly free

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

was his spirit from any intimidating influence that might have been anticipated from Mr. Duncombe's revelations—the importance of which was shown in the division, the amendment obtaining but 86 votes against 426.

The extent of the agitation that was being got up respecting the corn laws was displayed by the number of petitions that were presented to the House from the commencement of the session; but on Mr. Villiers (Feb. 14) moving that certain allegations expressed in some of them, be permitted to be proved at the bar of the House, he was opposed by Lord Stanley, Lord John Russell, Sir Robert Peel, and other influential members, and his motion negatived by 361 votes against 172.

On the 25th, Lord John Russell moved the second reading of the Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill, and though Sir Robert Inglis expressed grave objections to some of its provisions, Sir Robert Peel supported it. Indeed, as he acknowledged, it differed but slightly from the suggestions of the Commission he had himself appointed.

Two days later Mr. Serjeant Talfourd moved the second reading of his Bill for the extension of copyright to authors, which, though opposed as usual by Mr. Hume, was carried by a majority of nearly two to one. The second reading of the Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Bill, after a protracted debate, was carried on the 8th of March; and on the 12th, Mr. Villiers submitted his motion

for a Committee of the whole House to take into consideration the Act ix. cap. 60, of George IV., regulating the importation of foreign grain. The debate that ensued was carried on with great spirit, and a division took place after five discussions, when the motion was rejected by a majority of 147. The same subject was debated in the Lords, on the motion of Earl Fitzwilliam, which was opposed by the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Ripon, the Duke of Wellington, and Lord Melbourne; and on a division only 24 peers voted in its favour against 224.

In a very small house, Mr. Hume, on the 21st, brought forward his scheme for improving and amending the Reform Bill. He now stated his opinion that universal suffrage was impossible in this country; but having pronounced the Reform Bill, that he had once zealously advocated, to be founded on erroneous principles, he said he was desirous that the House should go into Committee to reconsider the subject.[1] Lord John Russell opposed, in the first place, on the ground that many of the towns that were to be benefited by the proposed change were notorious for bribery and corruption; and in the second, because, if the demand now made for household suffrage were conceded, it would raise a cry for universal suffrage, and the result would be that faith could not be kept with the public creditor. After a languid

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

debate, the question was disposed of by a majority of 85 against 50.

On the same day the Government were defeated in the House of Lords on a motion proposed by the Earl of Roden for an inquiry into the state of Ireland, which, under the auspices of the Marquis of Normanby, was stated to be in a frightful condition. The Duke of Wellington and Lord Brougham expressed themselves in favour of the motion, and Lord Melbourne opposed it; but on a division 63 peers voted for and 58 against it.

This result caused Lord John Russell to address the House on the 22nd, when, having intimated that Lord Ebrington[1] had superseded the Marquis of Normanby as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, he proposed at an early period to take the opinion of the House as to the Irish Administration, adding the warning that an unfavourable result would cause the resignation of the Government. Subsequently, in a Committee of Supply to consider the navy estimates, a vote was taken for an additional force of 5000 men.

Ministers were not gaining ground in public confidence; indeed, their proceedings daily increased the sense of insecurity which had long been created by their policy wherever it was understood. In England and Scotland the Radicals were betray-

[1] He had been called to the House of Peers on the 28th of February, by the title of Baron Fortescue, and was appointed Lord Lieutenant on the 1st of March.

ing both distrust and contempt; but in Ireland the state of society was infinitely more disturbed, and the appointment of Lord Ebrington to the Government there was not calculated to affect any beneficial change. The opinion expressed by the House of Lords appears to have exercised a sensible effect upon the nation, and prepared them for a further manifestation of disapproval.

On the 9th of April, Mr. Labouchere, in the House of Commons, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to suspend the executive constitution and to make provision for the temporary government of Jamaica; the House of Assembly there having placed itself in hostility to the Governor when he sought to carry out the provisions of an Act recently passed by the Imperial Legislature, called the "West India Prisons Act," to which it was clear a very large majority of that Assembly entertained insurmountable objections, and the usual liberality of a liberal government was now about to be brought against them. After some objections had been expressed by Mr. Goulburn and Sir Robert Peel, leave was given to bring in the Bill.

Ministers hazarded a trial at the bar of public opinion in a court where they considered their influence was overwhelming, when Lord John Russell, on the 15th, proposed the following resolution in the House of Commons:—"That it is the opinion of the House that it is expedient to persevere in those principles which have guided the Executive

Government of Ireland of late years, and which have tended to *the effectual administration of the law and the general improvement of that part of the United Kingdom.*"

This was singularly audacious; the words evidently selected with an intention of implying anything but respect for the deliberate judgment of the other House of Parliament. But even Lord John Russell would not have committed himself to such a declaration had he not well considered his position.

Sir Robert Peel accepted the challenge that had thus been expressed, and proposed an amendment, which, after recalling to the recollection of the House a motion for papers illustrating the alarming condition of Ireland, carried on the 12th of March last, without opposition from the Government, and the appointment of a Committee in the Lords, on the 21st of the same month, to inquire into the state of that portion of the United Kingdom, stated:—

"That it appears to this House that the appointment of a Committee of Inquiry by the House of Lords, under the circumstances and for the purpose above mentioned, does not justify her Majesty's Ministers in calling upon this House, without previous inquiry or even the production of the information which this House has required, to make a declaration of opinion with respect to one branch of the Executive Government, still less a declaration

of opinion which is neither explicit as to the principles which it professes to approve, nor definite as to the period to which it refers; and that it is not fitting that this House should adopt a proceeding which has the appearance of calling in question the undoubted right of the House of Lords to inquire into the state of Ireland with respect to crime and outrage, more especially when the exercise of that right by the House of Lords does not interfere with any previous proceeding or resolution of the House of Commons, nor with the progress of any legislative measure assented to by the House of Commons or at present under its consideration."

The weak points of Lord John Russell's proposal were here fairly brought into view, and were fully exposed during a week's prolonged debate on the question; but the Government had gone too far to recede. Having been so often met by the adverse judgments of the House of Lords, their indignation could no longer be controlled. They had "plucked up a spirit," and in their desire for retaliation had completely lost sight of ordinary prudence. The division must have been an additional mortification to them; for even with the assistance of the Irish Repealers, they could only produce a majority of 22. This was morally a defeat. England and Scotland had pronounced against them.

Mr. Duncombe, forgetful of the fate of Mr. Hume's motion on the same subject, thought

proper to bring forward an amendment in favour of further reform, but it was negatived by a majority of 299 to 81.

The Government had hazarded a conflict of opinion, and had got the worst of it. Their confidence in their own strength was fated to be shaken by a more decided evidence of its decay; for on the 3rd of May, on the order of the day for the House going into Committee on the Jamaica Bill, Sir Robert Peel opposed the motion in one of his most stirring orations, in which the arbitrary character of the proposed measure was most skilfully exposed; and after a prolonged debate, in which Ministers and their supporters vainly endeavoured to remove the impression their illiberal policy had created, a division on the 6th showed that their majority had declined to *five*.

So decided a diminution of parliamentary support effectually roused the Cabinet out of their dream of security, and opened their eyes to their true position. They could not conceal from themselves that, despite of their much-vaunted influence with their Sovereign, and the extreme care they had displayed to maintain this intact; notwithstanding the pains they had taken to establish an overwhelming majority in the House of Commons—despite, too, of their assumption of an exclusive right to liberal legislation—their rule appeared to be approaching its termination. As much as possible to remove the feeling against them which the harsh measure

they had been intent on dealing out to the Jamaica Assembly had created, they anticipated their dismissal with a frankness and kindliness of manner that would have been singularly amiable under the circumstances, had it not arisen from confidence in the success of a manœuvre they had skilfully arranged.

On the following day Lord John Russell in the Commons, and Lord Melbourne in the Lords, announced the resignation of themselves and their colleagues; the former for so doing putting forward the plea of not desiring to expose to jeopardy the colonial empire; the latter with characteristic *nonchalance*, after referring to "the great measure" which had been so emphatically condemned, acknowledged that it was *now* no longer possible for him to administer the affairs of her Majesty's Government in a manner that could be useful and beneficial to the country.[1]

Her Majesty had given her confidence so entirely to "the friends of her youth," as some members of the fallen Government were styled, that, as was very natural, she did not like parting with them, and probably liked still less seeing faces with which she was familiar, banished from her presence to make room for strangers of whom she knew nothing, except from reports that could scarcely have been otherwise than hostile. On the day that followed the formal resignation of Lords Melbourne and

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

John Russell, her Majesty sent for the Duke of Wellington, who, after hearing the Queen's expressions of regret at being obliged to change her servants, and her appeal for counsel, informed her Majesty that the chief difficulty in the way of establishing a satisfactory Government such as he had been invited to form lay in the House of Commons; and as it would be necessary to have some one at the head of the Administration who possessed considerable parliamentary influence as well as high administrative ability, he recommended her to send for Sir Robert Peel.

Sir Robert Peel had an interview with the Queen, when her Majesty repeated that she had parted with her Ministers with great regret, acknowledging that they had given her entire satisfaction; and stated that, as it had become necessary to take some step towards the formation of another Administration, she had sent for him at the suggestion of the Duke of Wellington. The conversation that followed has not been reported; but Sir Robert subsequently in the House of Commons affirmed that no one could have expressed more fully, more naturally, or more becomingly, the regret which her Majesty felt for the loss of her late advisers, or principles more strictly constitutional with respect to the formation of a new Government.

Unfortunately the new Minister thus thrust, as it might be considered, upon his youthful Sovereign,

possessed none of the brilliant social qualities of his predecessor; and it is not surprising that, under the circumstances of the case, he should have failed in making a favourable impression. At the close of the interview he intimated that he should be prepared on the following day to submit a general arrangement for filling the principal offices of State for her Majesty's approval—an announcement that was, as the sequel proved, entirely superfluous.

During the day the new Minister communicated with the Duke of Wellington, Lord Lyndhurst, the Earl of Aberdeen, Lord Ellenborough, Lord Stanley, Sir James Graham, Sir Henry Hardinge, and Mr. Goulburn, and with such success that on the following morning he waited on her Majesty with the arrangements completed, according to his promise. The Queen looked over the names, and in reference to the Duke of Wellington Sir Robert stated that his Grace had desired to be included in the Cabinet, without an office which would require him to take the lead in the House of Lords; but her Majesty expressed a particular wish that the Duke should hold an important post in the Administration.

After these things had been settled, the next subject for consideration was the change in the Royal household—to the Queen, in all probability, the least agreeable part of the arrangement, as the duties of such offices placed the individuals by whom they were performed nearer to her person, which

would render strangers still more unacceptable. As far as regarded noblemen and gentlemen, no grave objection was raised; but the ladies who had been her Majesty's associates since her accession were, it was evident, not so easily to be parted with. The Minister tried to meet the wishes of his Sovereign, but he knew the danger of allowing in his own camp persons in possession of her confidence whose nearest male relatives must be his most formidable political opponents. Anxious, however, to meet her Majesty's wishes as far as was possible, he proposed that some of the ladies of the household should retain their places; but her Majesty insisted that not one of them should be removed, and when the Duke of Wellington subsequently was honoured with an interview, a similar determination was still more firmly expressed.

Afterwards it is certain, and not unlikely before, her Majesty sent for Lord Melbourne, by whose advice she wrote the following letter:—

THE QUEEN TO SIR ROBERT PEEL, BART.

Buckingham Palace, May 10, 1839.

The Queen having considered the proposal made to her yesterday by Sir Robert Peel, to remove the ladies of her bedchamber, cannot consent to adopt a course which she conceives to be contrary to usage, and which is repugnant to her feelings.

It appears from a statement made a few days

later in the House of Commons by Lord John Russell, that this letter was submitted by Lord Melbourne to his late colleagues, who approved of it. The ex-Ministers seized upon their Sovereign's disinclination to part with some of her attendants with such extraordinary avidity, that it excites a reasonable suspicion of their having anticipated it; and knowing the insurmountable difficulty it would create, had kept themselves within an easy distance, in council assembled, ready to take immediate advantage of the opening to a restoration to place and power it was well calculated to afford them.

Having directed this dismissal of their opponent, the most extraordinary rumours respecting his want of consideration for the Queen's feelings began to circulate. There is little doubt, however, that had either of them been in the position of Sir Robert Peel, he would have been much more exacting. No Minister should undertake to carry on the government of the country without the full confidence of his Sovereign, and Sir Robert consulted his own dignity in the course he adopted, which, it is scarcely necessary to add, met with the entire approbation of the eminent men who had expressed their willingness to join with him in forming a new Administration.

Without loss of time he wrote the following letter to the Queen:—

SIR ROBERT PEEL TO THE QUEEN

Whitehall, May 10, 1839.

Sir Robert Peel presents his humble duty to your Majesty, and has had the honour of receiving your Majesty's note of this morning. In respectfully submitting to your Majesty's pleasure, and humbly returning into your Majesty's hands the important trust which your Majesty had been graciously pleased to commit to him, Sir Robert Peel trusts that your Majesty will permit him to state to your Majesty his impression with respect to the circumstances which have led to the termination of his attempt to form an Administration for the conduct of your Majesty's service. In the interview with which your Majesty honoured Sir Robert Peel yesterday morning, after he had submitted to your Majesty the names of those whom he proposed to recommend to your Majesty for the principal executive appointments, he mentioned to your Majesty his earnest wish to be enabled, with your Majesty's sanction, so to constitute your Majesty's household that your Majesty's confidential servants might have the advantage of a public demonstration of your Majesty's full support and confidence, and that at the same time, so far as possible consistently with that demonstration, each individual appointment in the household should be entirely acceptable to your Majesty's personal feelings.

On your Majesty's expressing a desire that the Earl of Liverpool should hold an office in the household, Sir Robert Peel requested your Majesty's permission at once to offer to Lord Liverpool the office of Lord Steward, or any other which he might prefer. Sir Robert Peel then

observed that he should have every wish to apply a similar principle to the chief appointments which are filled by the ladies of your Majesty's household, upon which your Majesty was pleased to remark that you must reserve the whole of those appointments, and that it was your Majesty's pleasure that the whole should continue as at present, without any change.

The Duke of Wellington, in the interview to which your Majesty subsequently admitted him, understood also that this was your Majesty's determination, and concurred with Sir Robert Peel in opinion that, considering the great difficulties of the present crisis, and the expediency of making every effort in the first instance to conduct the public business of the country with the aid of the present Parliament, it was essential to the success of the commission with which your Majesty had honoured Sir Robert Peel, that he should have that public proof of your Majesty's entire support and confidence which would be afforded by the permission to make some changes in that part of your Majesty's household which your Majesty resolved on maintaining entirely without change.

Having had the opportunity, through your Majesty's gracious consideration, of reflecting upon this point, he humbly submits to your Majesty that he is reluctantly compelled, by a sense of public duty and the interests of your Majesty's service, to adhere to the opinion which he ventured to express to your Majesty.

He trusts he may be permitted at the same time to express to your Majesty his grateful acknowledgments for the distinction which your Majesty conferred upon him, by requiring his advice and assistance in the attempt to form an Administration, and his earnest prayers that whatever arrangements your Majesty may be enabled to

make for that purpose, may be most conducive to your Majesty's personal comfort and happiness, and in the promotion of the public welfare.

Thus ended this Court interlude—just as had been expected by those who enjoyed the reputation of having devised it. The coadjutors who had remained so conveniently behind the scenes, again came forward, and, apparently with the same cheerfulness with which they had surrendered office, resumed its possession. Notwithstanding the representations that had been made respecting Sir Robert Peel's indifference to the Queen's feelings, so well adapted to create a general prejudice against him, some shrewd observers persisted in entertaining a totally different opinion of the transaction.

Whatever may have been the sentiments of that distinguished statesman as to the part he had been made to play in it, he prudently did not allow them to appear in the explanation he gave the House of Commons on the 13th. Lord John Russell followed with another explanation, which some portion of his auditors considered singularly explanatory. It appears that he had also been sent for to the palace after the resignation of Sir Robert Peel had been received by the Queen, who, according to his statement "had not gathered the precise manner in which Sir Robert had proposed to exercise the power of removal." It does not appear that Lord John attempted to explain to her Majesty what

her Majesty had not clearly understood; indeed, his speech contains the following sentence:—

"She asked me whether I thought her justified in the line she had taken, and on my answering that I did, she said she hoped that, as she had supported our Administration, we should now be ready to support her."[1]

No comment can be necessary to point out the impropriety of representing the Sovereign as a partisan—devoted to one paricular set of men, and exclusively relying on their support. We at once pass to the "explanation" given on the next day, in the House of Lords, by Lord Melbourne, which contains other curious revelations. He therein acknowledges that he was admitted to an interview with his Royal Mistress *after* the Duke of Wellington had been sent for, and again on the following day *after* Sir Robert Peel had proposed his arrangements for a new Administration, when her Majesty informed him that Sir Robert had required that "*all* the ladies about the Court and *all* the ladies about the royal person should be dismissed." Under this impression, he said the Queen's letter had been written, and he and his colleagues had "entirely concurred in opinion with her Majesty," and were "determined at all hazards" to support her. Towards the conclusion of his speech he acknowledged that a difference of opinion had existed among his colleagues immediately previous

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

to their resignation; but assured the House that he had resumed his position "because he could not abandon his Sovereign in a period of much excitement and difficulty."

Whatever may be thought of the statement made in the House of Commons, this was infinitely more objectionable as regards its reference to the Queen. It excited the indignation of many of the peers, and the Duke of Wellington—generally a very cautious speaker—could scarcely restrain within parliamentary limits his desire to expose its disingenuousness. After some remarks on Lord Melbourne, he defended Sir Robert Peel, and clearly stated his opinion that a Minister of the Crown was entitled to control over all the appointments of the Sovereign's household, which became doubly necessary when the offices of every department had been long in the hands of an opposite party. The Duke then got rid of the plea that had been advanced of Sir Robert Peel's proposal being "contrary to usage," by pointing out the important difference that existed between the position of a Queen Consort and a Queen Regnant. He added, that though he would rather suffer any inconvenience than interfere with the comforts of the Sovereign, had he been in Sir Robert Peel's place, he should have acted exactly as he had done, such being demanded by the exigency of the occasion.

The re-instated Ministers in a Cabinet Council absolutely agreed to express their opinion in a minute,

which stated "that for the purpose of giving to the Administration that character of efficiency and stability, and those marks of the constitutional support of the Crown which are required to enable it to act usefully to the public service, it is reasonable that the great officers of the Court, and situations of the household held by Members of Parliament, should be included in the political arrangements made in a change in the Administration; but that they [the existing Ministers] are not of opinion that a similar principle should be applied or extended to the offices held by ladies in her Majesty's household."[1]

The parliamentary session continued, but the only beneficial result was a change in the Post Office that subsequently introduced the penny stamp. The Whigs had not conciliated the Radicals—amongst the labouring classes a most dangerous combination was being organized, and on the 14th of June Mr. T. Attwood presented to the House of Commons a petition—said to have upwards of a million and a quarter of signatures—containing the usual Chartist demands. As no particular attention was paid to this useless demonstration, about a month later, when a second Chartist meeting at Birmingham was attempted to be dispersed by the police, a serious riot ensued, attended by the usual acts of plunder, destruction, and conflagration, till the arrival of a strong armed force, civil and

[1] *Annual Register.*

military, put a stop to it; the mob, however, succeeded in destroying and making away with property to the value of nearly 40,000*l.*

On the 27th of August, Parliament was prorogued with a speech from the throne that presented no feature calling for remark. The Government, though free from parliamentary supervision, continued to be much embarrassed by the decline of their popularity; they found that their influence, however paramount in the palace, had totally disappeared in the quarter whence they once professed to have derived their principal support. A Chartist riot of a more serious character than that which had lately been suppressed at Birmingham, broke out among the colliers at Newport, on the 4th of November, when 10,000 men marched into the town under the command of a demagogue known as John Frost, and committed the usual wanton destruction; they were however soon dispersed by a small military force, after a conflict in which twenty of their number were killed and many wounded. The ringleaders were apprehended, tried, found guilty of treason, and sentenced to death, which was commuted to transportation for life.

It was well known that for many months past, both in Wales and in England, pikes had been manufactured, and fire-arms procured in great number; that secret drillings had taken place, and numerous robberies of arms effected. Early in May a movement of a revolutionary character had

been suppressed at Llandiloes, and some prisoners taken by the magistrates of the district. About the same time, similar demonstrations had been made in the neighbourhood of Manchester, in Westbury in Wiltshire, and at Trowbridge; but the police, being on the alert, had put a stop to the military studies of the misguided men, and had lodged their leaders in the nearest prisons.

A Chartist riot had occurred at Newcastle on the 21st of July; another, arising from the seizure of a chest of arms, at Stockport, in the same month; and a manufactory of cartridges was discovered at Hulme, near Manchester, early in August, where Chartist meetings were constantly taking place, as well as at Bolton and Nottingham. Attempts of the same nature were made in the Metropolis, and there was a meeting at Kennington Common, where inflammatory orations were delivered with no more serious effect than that of causing one of the demagogues, who had come from Newcastle, to be arrested on a warrant from the magistrates of that town.

Bad as the state of society had sometimes been within a recent period, it had never assumed a more alarming aspect than during a considerable portion of this year; Ministers, however, went on in their customary course, while mechanics were secretly arming and drilling. They created peers, and made fresh appointments in the household. The ladies in the royal establishment were living evidences of their efficiency—what more could be

wanted to prove it? As for popularity, it seemed to be their opinion that a statesman need only look for it within the palace.

The Conservative leaders saw how hopeless was their prospect of interposing to any beneficial purpose, and had satisfied themselves with declaring, by an occasional majority in the House of Lords, their protest against the more mischievous experiments at legislation that came under their consideration. Many withdrew their attention from politics, and sought more profitable or more agreeable pursuits. In the summer, the Marquis of Londonderry assisted the Earl of Eglintoun to revive at his castle near the Ayrshire coast, the picturesque pageants and ceremonies of chivalry, and, associated with many of the Earl's friends, produced a very good revival of the ancient tournament. Unfortunately for the effect, though the armour, the costume, the banners, the knights and ladies, even the horses, left nothing to be desired—the weather proved most intractable. Two years' preparation and enormous expense were in consequence, in a great measure, thrown away; for although a grand cavalcade left Eglintoun Castle on the 28th of August, at two o'clock in the afternoon, with heralds, banners, pursuivants, the Knight Marshal, the King of the Tournament, the Queen of Beauty, the Lord of the Tournament, the Jester, and a highly respectable assemblage of Knights and Ladies, Seneschals, Chamberlains, Esquires, Pages, and Men-at-arms, and took their way in procession

to the lists, which were overlooked by galleries, in which nearly two thousand spectators, many in ancient costume, were accommodated, it was during a drenching shower, that did not cease while the combats proceeded.

The following day the rain continued so perseveringly, that Lord Eglintoun and his chivalrous friends were confined to the house. On the third day an interval of sunshine permitted a tournay of eight knights, who did their devoirs at the barriers with so much spirit, that two of them were obliged to be separated by the Knight Marshal. This was followed by a banquet and ball. The next day, which was Saturday, proved so stormy, that all further proceedings of the kind were abandoned.

Among those who put on armour and joined in this revival, was an aspirant for the honours of chivalry, who had, only a few years before, with but two or three knights errant to assist him, attempted the conquest of one of the greatest monarchies of Europe. To fail in such an enterprise, of course, procured him a reputation that made him "the observed of all observers" at Eglintoun, where it is not improbable he meditated a similar adventure in which he figured a few months afterwards.

France had been growing into a more unsatisfactory state from the commencement of the year. Late in January, the entire Ministry resigned —early in February they resumed their functions,

and the Chamber of Deputies was dissolved—a coup d'état of some significance, but one likely to increase the unpopularity both of the King and his government. The result of the elections being against the latter, they again resigned. A new Ministry was organized, after considerable difficulty, on the 1st of April, an ominous commencement; on the 12th of May there was an alarming *émeute* in Paris, which would have grown into an insurrection had not a strong military force succeeded in crushing the body of armed working men that attempted it, of whom many were slain in the conflict, and 200 taken prisoners.

Another Ministry was formed immediately afterwards, with Marshal Soult as President of the Council, and Minister of Foreign Affairs, and once more the kingdom remained for some months in a state of enforced quietude: but the sullen murmurs that rose from those who had effected a revolution that had proved so unprofitable to them, though constantly suppressed, occasionally swelled out hoarse and deep, inviting any adventurer possessed of a spirit of enterprise and a popular name, to help them to throw off a yoke which lay so heavily upon their necks, with the assurance of a reward that must satisfy his utmost ambition. The invitation was heard and accepted.

CHAPTER XV.

[1840-60.]

CHARTIST RISING DEFEATED — MARRIAGE OF THE QUEEN — QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE — "STOCKDALE *versus* HANSARD" — MINISTERS PRONOUNCED "VERY CULPABLE" — LOUIS NAPOLEON AND FRANCE — AGITATION AGAINST THE CORN LAWS — UNPOPULARITY OF THE GOVERNMENT — GENERAL ELECTION IN FAVOUR OF THE CONSERVATIVES — SIR ROBERT PEEL FORMS AN ADMINISTRATION — ANTI-CORN LAW LEAGUE — PROSECUTION OF MR. O'CONNELL — MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY APPOINTED AMBASSADOR AT ST. PETERSBURG — POLITICAL HOSTILITY — DEATHS OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON AND SIR ROBERT PEEL — REVIVAL OF CONSERVATISM — SIR EDWARD BULWER LYTTON — DECLINE OF WHIG POPULARITY — EXTRAORDINARY QUALIFICATIONS OF LORD PALMERSTON — DEFEAT OF THE NEW REFORM BILL — PROSPECT OF THE COUNTRY.

CHAPTER XV.

THE year 1840 began ominously. The Chartists, who had been induced to believe in their overwhelming power, continued to exhibit a mischievous disposition, notwithstanding the failure of their various resorts to physical force, to prove that they were to be feared, when they found that they were no longer to be caressed. Their plans were usually known in time for the local authorities to make preparations to defeat them. In this way another formidable outbreak was suppressed at Sheffield, which had been arranged to take place on the night of the 11th of January, when this important manufacturing town was to have been simultaneously fired in several places, and, of course, during the confusion, plundered. Timely arrests of the leaders, and proper precautions against the meditated attack, frustrated the scheme.

On the 16th, the Queen opened Parliament in person. On this occasion, unusual interest attached to the speech from the throne. The marriage of her Majesty had for some time been anxiously desired by her faithful subjects; both the great

political parties appear to have looked forward to it with the deepest interest, as a means of increasing the happiness of their Sovereign and of insuring the welfare of the State: but one of them entertained other anticipations of the benefits it was likely to produce. They felt fully satisfied that it would put an end to an influence which had been exercised, in a manner that it was thought had already affected the dignity of the Crown.

The royal speech first announced the Queen's approaching union with Prince Albert of Saxe Coburg and Gotha—then the termination of the Civil War in Spain. Hopes were expressed that the affairs of the Levant and the negotiations for establishing diplomatic relations with Persia were drawing to a satisfactory settlement. References, not quite so assuring, were made to the state of affairs in China, with which Power we were at war; in India, where great military successes had been obtained by our troops westward of the Indus; and in Canada, where a warlike spirit still prevailed within the American frontier that threatened the colony. These were followed by a recommendation of early attention to the state of the municipal corporations in Ireland, and a desire that the measures suggested by the English Ecclesiastical Commission relating to the Established Church, should be proceeded with. The speech concluded with a declaration of the distress existing in the manufacturing districts, and of the spirit of insubor-

dination which had lately there been suppressed by armed force.

At the commencement of the session, much of the time of the House of Commons was taken up by the consideration of a question of Privilege. The House had published a report which contained some reflections on a well-known publisher, who brought an action against the printer for a libel. Lord Chief Justice Denman having expressed an opinion that the passage complained of was not a privileged communication, the plaintiff obtained a verdict with damages. Then the defendant, relying on the support of the House of Commons, refused to pay, and the sheriffs levied an execution for the sum, £640. Lord John Russell, on the 17th, moved that "John Joseph Stockdale had been guilty of a high contempt and a breach of the privileges of the House," and this being carried by a large majority, he was committed to the custody of the Serjeant-at-arms. Lord John then moved a series of resolutions, that the levy on Messrs. Hansard was a contempt of the privileges of the House, that the sheriffs should refund the money, and that they should be committed to the custody of the Serjeant-at-arms. The Court of Queen's Bench issued a writ of Habeas Corpus against that officer to produce the sheriffs, and the House of Commons came to a resolution to protect him.[1]

Sir Lucius O'Trigger might have considered this

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

"a mighty pretty quarrel as it stood:" it had some ugly features, nevertheless. Members should have hesitated before they put themselves in opposition to so sound a lawyer and temperate a judge as Lord Denman; the Government, however, did not coincide with this high legal authority, and as other law-makers appeared equally ready to place themselves above the law, the contest was carried on with unabated spirit. Another action was commenced by Stockdale against Hansard; the lawyer of the former was then, by a large majority of the House, committed to Newgate, and his client was soon afterwards sent to share his imprisonment. In vain such lawyers as Sir William Follett and Sir Edward Sugden interposed to induce the House to take a more dignified course. When the second action was commenced, Lord John Russell brought forward motion after motion to vindicate what he called the privileges of the House, and opposed with all the influence of Government every attempt made to settle the dispute properly. The son of Stockdale's lawyer was next sent to Newgate, and his clerk committed to the custody of the Serjeant-at-arms. Messrs. Hansard were directed not to plead to the action, and the under-sheriff, officers, and others—of course including the judge—were threatened with "the high displeasure of the House" if they took any further steps in the matter. Evidence was brought forward by Lord Mahon that one of the sheriffs was suffering from disease that was likely

to be seriously aggravated by his confinement, but Lord John Russell and his supporters rejected a motion that was made for his release. Subsequently, however, on the 5th of March, that functionary obtained his liberty, on condition of appearing at the bar of the House on the 6th of the following month.[1]

Lord John Russell brought in a Bill to stay legal proceedings arising from the publication of papers by the House of Commons, which, when it came before the Lords, on the 6th of April, elicited from Lord Denman a manly and dignified vindication of his judicial proceedings. The Lords made some amendments, which were considered by the Commons on the 11th, when a manifest difference of opinion respecting them was expressed by the Solicitor-General and Attorney-General; but Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel agreeing to them, they were suffered to pass.

Ministers were in the meantime subject to attacks of a still more damaging character. On the 27th of February, Mr. Liddell moved a series of resolutions respecting a recent arrangement, by which Sir John Newport, Comptroller-General of the Exchequer, was to receive a retiring pension of 1000*l.* to make way for Mr. Spring Rice, lately created Baron Monteagle, to his post, with a salary of 2000*l.* a year. In the course of the debate which followed, Sir James Graham expressed an opinion

[1] See *Annual Register*.

that Ministers had been "very culpable," which judgment the House affirmed by a majority against them of twenty-eight.

This producing no effect, on the 11th of April Sir James Graham moved a vote of censure against Government respecting the affairs of China, which was supported by Sir William Follett; and though they were defended by Mr. Macaulay, and their friends supported them during a debate that lasted three nights, they escaped by a majority of *nine* only.[1]

This was sufficiently significant of the state of public opinion; but Ministers appeared quite indifferent to it. They went on in their course, bringing forward measure after measure apparently with very little care whether they failed or succeeded. The value of Whig professions of economy was exemplified by an addition of ten per cent. on the assessed taxes, and five per cent. additional on customs, and 4*d.* a gallon on spirits, the necessity of which was said to exist in another startling deficiency of 2,732,000*l.* This was permitted by the House of Commons when the Chancellor of the Exchequer laid open his budget on the 15th of May. Three days later, when the order of the day was read for the House going into Committee on the Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill, Sir William Somerville moved as an amendment that it be committed that day six months. A spirited debate

[1] See debate in "Hansard."

ensued, which lasted for three nights; when on the division a majority was pronounced against Ministers of *three*, there being 301 members for the amendment and 298 against it.

Even this decision of a reformed House of Commons had no apparent effect upon the Government. They quietly went on doing nothing, and evidently caring nothing, till the 4th of August, when Mr. Hume complained bitterly of the results of the session—and well he might. On the 11th, Parliament was prorogued. Rarely had there been so barren a session. While increasing difficulties beset the country at home and abroad, the great legislative council of the nation, under the auspices of the Government, was wasting precious time in an unbecoming squabble, from which it could not by any possibility escape with dignity.

Our foreign policy did not appear to be more rational. In July a treaty had been signed in London by England, Austria, Russia, Prussia, and Turkey, to the exclusion of France, for the settlement of a complication which threatened the integrity of the Ottoman Empire—the Pasha of Egypt, one of its most powerful vassals, supported by the French Government, having demonstrated not only an intention of effecting its independence, but of taking possession of Syria, and our Government had resolved on that joint armed intervention which, in October and November, led to the fall of Beyrout and the bombardment of Acre.

This opposition to French interests brought out the national instincts of our restless neighbours most prominently. A singular event occurred on the 6th of August, which, though it appeared Quixotic to many, was a fact of the gravest significance. This was the landing at Boulogne of Prince Louis Napoleon, nephew of the Emperor, accompanied by about half a hundred associates, for the purpose of creating an insurrection. Boulogne, however, proved as little favourable to the illustrious knight-errant as Strasburg had done in 1836. The garrison were loyal, and the national-guard attacking the Prince and his companions before they could make good their retreat to the vessel that had brought them from England, several of the adventurers were killed and the rest captured.

Prince Louis Napoleon was subsequently tried by the Chamber of Peers and sentenced to perpetual imprisonment—an advantage to him of vast importance at the time, for it at once brought his pretensions with the greatest prominence before the entire nation, and excited the general sympathy, while the Government and the King continued to fall into increasing disrepute. Changes in the former produced no change in public opinion. In March, Soult had retired in favour of Thiers; in October, Thiers retired in favour of Soult. In September, work was found for the Parisians in the projected erection of a bastioned wall thirty feet high, ostensibly to protect the capital against foreign

enemies. In less than a month afterwards another attempt at the King's life was prevented by the bursting of the overcharged pistol in the hands of his intended assassin.

With Guizot as Foreign Minister, the relations of France with England began to assume a more pacific character; but the advisers of Louis Philippe appeared to be unconsciously assisting to bring about his destruction in the application they suggested to the British Government for the removal of the remains of Napoleon I. from St. Helena to Paris. This was effected on the 15th of December, to the immense increase of Bonapartism and the corresponding development of the interest felt by the French nation for the Emperor's imprisoned nephew.

The commencement in England of the parliamentary session of 1841 was regarded by politicians opposed to the Government as the opening of a campaign intended to be decisive. There was reason to believe that Ministers were daily losing that firm support which had enabled them to maintain their places. The people generally had long lost all confidence in them, and they had been looking about for a popular appeal, but evidently without being able to decide on the character it should assume. The abrogation of the corn laws was a favourite speculation with an increasing section of the Radicals, particularly in the large manufacturing districts, where the price of

bread was a source of the deepest anxiety, and the establishment of the Corn-Law League for the purpose of combined agitation to force the Government into the removal of the existing restrictions on free trade in grain, gradually became a formidable organization. The labouring classes entered with their usual impulsiveness into a scheme that promised to cheapen the great necessary of life, and their wealthy employers forwarded with equal enthusiasm a project that offered to them a prospect of the reduction of wages.

During the early part of the session, the Government watched this movement without betraying any uneasiness; but as it became general, they seemed to grow more anxious to attempt a compromise. On the 7th of May, Lord John Russell, in his place in the House of Commons, announced a ministerial plan of settling the question by a reduction in the duties. This created a long and lively debate, during which the conduct of Ministers was severely censured; and immediately their intentions became known, meetings of a very disturbed character were held in London, Liverpool, Manchester, and other large cities, where public opinion was still more decidedly expressed against them.

That they had lost the parliamentary support which had kept them so long in their places, was proved by a division that took place on the 18th, respecting the sugar duties, when they mustered only 281 votes against 317; and as this signal defeat

did not appear to affect them, Sir Robert Peel, on the 24th, announced his intention to move a resolution, "That her Majesty's Ministers do not sufficiently possess the confidence of the House of Commons to enable them to carry through the House measures which they deem of essential importance to the public welfare; and that their continuance in office under such circumstances is at variance with the spirit of the Constitution."[1]

On the 29th, a debate followed the moving of this resolution, which was protracted for four days; and though the Government, taking this to be a life-and-death struggle, made the most strenuous exertions to secure a victory, they were defeated in an unusually large House by a majority of *one*—312 to 311. Even this, however, did not convince Ministers that they ought to resign; and Lord John Russell announced their intention to appeal to the country. Parliament was therefore prorogued on the 22nd of June, and dissolved on the following day.

A general election ensued; and Parliament met on the 19th of July; but though the Government employed every available resource to increase the number of their supporters, the first debate in both Houses proved how completely they had forfeited the confidence of the country—an amendment on the address being carried against them in the Lords by 168 to 96, and in the Commons by 360 to 269. On the 30th,

[1] See "Hansard."

Ministers at last announced their resignation. The new Ministry was arranged on the 6th of September, and was thus constituted:—

Sir Robert Peel	*First Lord of the Treasury.*
Lord Lyndhurst	*Lord High Chancellor.*
Lord Wharncliffe	*Lord President of the Council.*
Duke of Wellington	(Without Office.)
Duke of Buckingham	*Lord Privy Seal.*
Right Honourable H. Goulburn	*Chancellor of the Exchequer.*
Sir James Graham	*Secretary of State for the Home Department.*
Earl of Aberdeen	*Secretary for the Foreign Department.*
Lord Stanley	*Secretary for the Colonies.*
Sir Henry Hardinge	*Secretary at War.*
Earl of Lincoln	*First Commissioner of Land Revenue.*
Earl of Haddington	*First Lord of the Admiralty.*
Lord Ellenborough	*President of the Board of Control.*
Earl of Ripon	*President of the Board of Trade.*
Sir Edward Knatchbull	*Paymaster-General.*
Lord Lowther	*Postmaster-General.*
Sir Frederick Pollock	*Attorney-General.*
Sir William Follett	*Solicitor-General.*
Lord Granville Somerset	*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.*
Earl de Grey	*Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.*
Sir Edward Sugden	*Lord Chancellor.*
Lord Eliot	*Chief Secretary.*
Mr. Blackburne	*Attorney-General.*
Mr. Pennefather	*Solicitor-General.*

Mr. W. E. Gladstone filled the post of Vice-President of the Board of Trade; Sir George Murray became Master-General of the Ordnance; the Earl of Liverpool, Lord Steward; Earl de la Warr, Lord Chamberlain; and the Earl of Jersey, Master of the Horse.

The Conservatives returned to office under circumstances more unfavourable than had ever before accompanied them to power. Whig government

had so dealt with the finances of the country, that from the 5th of January, 1838, to the same date 1853, the deficiency amounted to *ten millions, seventy-two thousand, six hundred and thirty-eight pounds sterling!*[1] Though reform legislation had promised such great things for the manufacturing population, the operatives of Paisley, Leeds, Manchester, Stockport, Bolton, and similar districts, were in such a state of distress, that a Committee of Inquiry ascertained that in Leeds 747 families were obliged to subsist on 1*s.* 4*d.* per head per week; 214 on 4¾*d.* per head; while 1946 families had no means of subsistence.

It was in such communities that the agitation against the "bread tax," as the corn laws were styled, was sure of spreading far and wide. What drowning men are proverbially said to do, starving men may be excused for attempting; but none of the professional orators sent amongst them made known to these strugglers for life and death the fact they subsequently realized, that the grain which had become a vital necessity had been taken from the straw they were permitted to seize.

The excitement on the subject had become general; and, as usual, the Whigs out of office speedily exhibited an intention of profiting by popular feeling as much as possible. Sir Robert

[1] See returns quoted by Sir Robert Peel in the House of Commons in his Speech of the 11th of March.

Peel determined on bringing forward a measure that he considered would meet the exigency. There can be no necessity for giving any further description of the progress of this popular movement. Every one knows that its success was complete, as far as it affected the interests of its principal promoters; every one also knows, or ought to know, that its chief appeal to the nation—the security it held out of maintaining bread cheap—has signally failed.

The principal actors in the great drama that had been performed before the nation, now began to make their exit from the scene, and the voice of that most careful prompter, Ambition, reached them no more. Two or three had already left the stage—Lord Holland and Lord Durham, in 1840—who were classed with the ablest men of their party.

Perhaps the most remarkable close of any similar professional career was that of the most popular performer in his line that had ever appeared since the excitable days of "Wilkes and Liberty." The reader has seen how completely the Whigs allowed Mr. O'Connell to establish a power in Ireland which appeared to permit that of the Imperial Government till it should be convenient to do without it. Towards the end of October, 1841, in the first municipal election after the Whig measure had become the law of the land, he contrived to be elected Lord Mayor of Dublin; and the increase

of popularity with his countrymen which this civic honour procured for him, emboldened him to push his influence as far as he could, in opposition to the existing Ministry. The sentiments he entertained towards the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, he took no pains to conceal; and, apparently holding them in contempt, he began a course of agitation on a larger and more daring scale than he had ever before attempted. Monster meetings were held one after another, and declarations expressed that breathed defiance in every syllable. Nothing seemed so clear as that a most formidable movement was in progress, by which, professedly to maintain "Ireland for the Irish," he intended to effect a separation of that portion of the United Kingdom from England.

Finding that no apparent notice was taken by the Government of his proceedings, he fancied that they were as much afraid of meddling with him as the Whigs had been, and continued on his course with increased boldness. He summoned another monster meeting on the 8th of October, 1843—"the repeal year," as he had styled it, in which he had promised that Ireland should have a Parliament of her own sitting on College Green. The place selected for this demonstration, with a particular significance, was Clontarf, the site of a battle fought and gained by the Irish over the Danes; and it was made known far and wide among the excitable peasantry, that the "Liberator" was about to "strike

the blow" he had so often suggested to the "hereditary bondsmen."

While the general excitement was at its height, a proclamation appeared on the day preceding, from the Lord Lieutenant and Council at Dublin, prohibiting the meeting, and stigmatizing the proposers of it as factious and seditious. The effect was instantaneous and universal, and this prodigious and menacing agitation at once collapsed.

O'Connell's reputation in England had previously been seriously damaged by a series of well-written articles that appeared in the *Times* journal, describing the real nature of his influence. The writer had fearlessly penetrated into the district over which Mr. O'Connell ruled as a landlord, and the great man, annoyed by this apparent contempt of his power, ventured upon personalities which betrayed his ignorance of the offender, as well as his ill-will.[1] He never recovered from the fall which the well-timed and vigorous measure of Sir Robert Peel had given him. The able Minister followed up his victory by causing the agitator, with eight of his associates, including one of his sons, to be arrested on a charge of conspiracy, sedition, and unlawfully assembling. In due time they were tried, found guilty, and sentenced to fine and imprisonment, notwithstanding every effort legal skill could devise to interfere with the course of justice. He survived this punishment about three years.

[1] See the able reports of the *Times'* commissioner.

Lord Hill died in 1842, which caused a vacancy in the colonelcy of the cavalry regiment that had been so much desired by the Marquis of Londonderry, on whom it was now bestowed. Shortly afterwards another distinction was offered to him. The Government, aware that at this juncture they required at St. Petersburg a man possessed of high military talent, resolution, and diplomatic sagacity, selected him to be Ambassador to the Court of Russia: but because during the Reform agitation, the Marquis had acted and spoken his sentiments in a manly manner, the pretended "Liberals" affected to be indignant at this appointment, and contrived to get up a prodigious clamour against it in Parliament and in the press. Lord Londonderry had already been assaulted by the mob, and had had his windows shattered by their missiles; but this was not considered sufficient punishment for his conscientious opposition to a measure the delusive character of which he knew better than they were likely to do. It was, however, not the mob only that he had offended; the concocters of the measure were far more irreconcileable, and they eagerly seized upon an opportunity to injure a political opponent.

The following memorandum is in the handwriting of Lord Londonderry, and refers to the proceedings in Parliament respecting his appointment:—

NOTE BY THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY.

In a conversation at the Drawing-room with Lord J. ——, Lord L. asked him what he seriously looked to in the present state of parties in the Opposition, if Sir Robert Peel in disgust was forced to throw up the Government. Lord J. —— replied, he looked only to an American constitution for England.

Lord J. —— came up to Lord L. at Devonshire House, and said a member of the H. of C. was desirous of bringing on the motion against Lord L. But that he, Lord J. ——, had reprobated it, and declared he would not join in it or approve it. It was brought on, notwithstanding, by Mr. Sheil; and two days after, Lord J. —— took the initiative in pressing Sir Robert Peel on the case, notwithstanding what had passed in his conversation with Lord L.

The vindictive opposition in Parliament to the appointment of Lord Londonderry was followed up with increased animosity by the Whig and Radical journals, till the Minister, who ought to have despised such clamour, thought it prudent, with due consideration for the difficulties by which he was surrounded, to attempt to propitiate popular opinion by rescinding the nomination.

Thus most unjustly, as well as most impolitically, a nobleman of the highest character and abilities, favourably known to the Emperor of Russia, was deprived of the opportunity of serving his country effectually, at a period when a good understanding

between the Courts of London and St. Petersburg was essential to the interests of both countries, to gratify private spite and public prejudice. There is reason to believe that the anti-British policy of the Russian Government which, under the management of English diplomacy, a few years later produced that discreditable climax of official blundering, the Crimean War, commenced from this date; and that the blood and treasure it cost England would have been saved, and the ill-feeling it created throughout Russia prevented, had Lord Londonderry been permitted to fulfil the duties of the important post in which he had been placed. Subsequently, Lord Londonderry accepted an honorary appointment in the Household. He died March 6th, 1854. Lord Melbourne pre-deceased him November 24th, 1848.

The Duke of Wellington in the last few years of his eventful career gained more than his former reputation with his countrymen, and in the estimation of his Sovereign no man in the kingdom stood so high. With all classes of the population, affection and reverence were largely mingled in the homage with which they continued to regard the venerable Duke whenever he appeared in public. He assisted at the councils of State on all important occasions, and was generally consulted by the Queen. In short, we doubt whether any British subject ever attained a tithe of the moral influence with which the character of his Grace was now

invested. On the 14th of September, 1852, this truly illustrious man was removed to a better world; and the reader cannot have forgotten the imposing pageant by which the nation showed its appreciation of his greatness, when all that was mortal of the statesman and soldier was carried to its last resting-place.

We have no space, had we the inclination, to enter upon an analysis of Sir Robert Peel's policy while he directed the Administration he had formed. His principal measure that brought about the abrogation of the Corn Laws, while it was severely condemned by a large and influential section of the Conservative party, did not secure for him any lasting hold on the affections of the class of politicians for whom he had deserted them at that singular crisis when Lord John Russell was called upon to form a Government, and after a due interval, was obliged to acknowledge his failure. This occurred in the session of 1845, when the power of the Corn-Law League, ably directed, produced an impression on the mind of the Minister, far deeper than had been created by the fiercest outburst of Irish agitation, or the most menacing combination of English Chartism. The Corn Laws were repealed the following year. A few months subsequently, the Peel Cabinet succumbed under the hostile attacks of some of the Conservatives and the Whigs, and Lord John Russell succeeded in forming an Administration, which for a time was supported

by the influence of the displaced Minister. The spectacle that Whigs in office had made familiar to the nation, of a Government with a *maximum* of patronage and a *minimum* of moral influence, was repeated, till an accidental fall from his horse on the 29th of June, deprived them of whatever advantage they may have derived from Sir Robert Peel's support. He died on the 2nd of July.

The Conservative party, after the loss of its leader, had rallied under the direction of Lord George Bentinck, who, powerfully assisted by Mr. Disraeli, maintained a position that was equally respected by the Peelites and the Whigs. The early death of that patriotic nobleman created a vacancy that was most efficiently filled by Lord Stanley (Earl of Derby), who has subsequently displayed, both in and out of office, the highest qualities of a statesman. More than once he has been called upon to form an Administration under circumstances of peculiar difficulty, and having succeeded in unravelling the tangled web of government difficulties, financial and diplomatic, created by his predecessors, he has been obliged to retire before the usual combination of Whig and Radical partisans.

Lord Derby has been ably supported—especially by Mr. Disraeli, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose extraordinary eloquence in debate and influence in the Cabinet, have obtained for him the lead of the House of Commons, and must insure to

him in any future Administration one of its highest offices. Mr. Walpole, if without some of the more brilliant qualifications of his colleague, showed that he possessed rare qualifications for office. He also brought with him a character strongly marked by honesty of purpose, and a devotion to his duties that seemed to grow stronger as his labour increased. Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton has acquired an unusual amount of intellectual fame; as a novelist, dramatist, poet, and historian, his numerous works had placed him foremost among the sterling writers of his age; but as the representative of one of the most ancient families in England, and as a member for an influential county, he came into Parliament with all the *prestige* which a popularity that embraced all ranks could confer. He soon made it apparent that among the attainments by which he had been so bountifully gifted, he possessed eloquence, not of that merely declamatory kind of which we have had so many examples, but that which makes the most convincing use of a careful study of every subject the speaker undertakes to illustrate.

Having in this way raised himself to the first rank of parliamentary orators in the estimation both of friends and opponents, in the last Conservative Government he received an important Cabinet appointment. His untiring attention to the business of his department, his numerous lucid yet elaborate expositions of every question of policy he was

required to defend, and the sound discrimination he displayed in the appointment of his subordinates, point him out as one of the most efficient Secretaries of State that has held office since the establishment of our colonial empire.

The position of the country, and of Europe, makes all earnest politicians desire to see the higher offices of the State filled by public men who in a marked degree enjoy the public confidence. Of mere popular idols we have already had too many; none of them has shown the ability, even if he possessed the inclination, to direct the policy of a great country in a great emergency. We have not forgotten the collapse, in our Crimean difficulties, of certain prodigious bubbles that had been expanded by the breath of a too confiding people. What England now demands of her administrative officers is the highest possible standard of intelligence, combined with an equal elevation of principle.

The Whigs we have had an opportunity of seeing again in office—going on from day to day very much in the same style of political existence which distinguished their former attempts at government. Indeed the old performances have been repeated with scarcely any variation, even to the rash experiments of one branch of the Legislature being rendered innocuous by the wise interposition of the other.

The gifts of one man supply that mechanical quality known as the attraction of cohesion, that

keeps such dissimilar elements together. No fair critic of public men can deny that Lord Palmerston is a statesman of extraordinary resources. Indeed, his experience, his tact, his judgment, his inexhaustible good-humour, and rare political sagacity, have maintained his party in power, when blunders of every kind have most severely tried the patience of the nation. The Premier is one of the few Whigs who have profited by their Conservative education; he was a pupil of Pitt, and a contemporary of Grenville and Castlereagh, Wellington and Canning. More than half a century has elapsed since he learned his qualifications in a school that produced the most eminent statesmen of his age; and though circumstances have made him diverge from the path in which his career commenced, his early lessons have enabled him to maintain an elevated position in popular estimation when the reputation of his colleagues has fallen to the ground.

The Duke of Wellington, it is well known, left no political successor. Sir Robert Peel has the reputation of having trained a select circle of pupils, of whom several have evinced administrative talent of a very high character, and one, eloquence that rivals his own. Consistency, however, seems to be growing so completely out of fashion, that it is impossible to state with any precision what principles now actuate many public men. There really exists nothing, apparently, to prevent any one from

being anything; the old landmarks of party have been so completely lost sight of, that Whig stragglers are continually appearing on the Conservative demesne, and Conservative excursionists wander over the Whig boundaries, without betraying the slightest apprehensions of trespassing.

It is not to be thought from this that either party has lost its identity; for the former is more homogeneous than ever it was, and can boast among its leaders rare combinations of principles and intellect, which have, despite of the powerful operation of prejudice, in their intervals of office won for them the esteem of all fair judges of fair dealing. The latter goes on in its characteristic course, always putting forward extraordinary pretensions, always realizing ordinary results. All kinds of expedients having been attempted with inadequate success, and the Manchester politicians pressing them hard, a second Reform Bill was had recourse to. No measure, however, has ever been inaugurated with so little excitement, or failed with so little regret; the delusive promises of the first appeared to be in everybody's memory, and the proposed extension of the franchise of its successor seemed everywhere met with the question, What good was effected by the previous experiment?

We were promised a perfect parliamentary reformation, has the Reform Bill diminished bribery? The change effected has not been an improvement. The owners of the proprietary boroughs selected

men of talent and character as representatives; but it is notorious that since their extinction, in certain places the candidate who possesses the longest purse is almost sure of a majority of votes.

It was evidently from a consideration of these facts that a large portion of the public press set itself strongly against a new reform agitation; and to this we owe the very little attention bestowed on a scheme to increase the evils already perpetrated. The debates on the subject when this second attempt at political reformation was brought under the consideration of Parliament, have fully exposed its pretentiousness and mischievous tendency;[1] and we believe that it will not be easy for any man, or set of men, to make the intelligence of the country insensible to the value of the experience it has so dearly bought.

The state of parties at this period is far from disheartening to those who have a Conservative interest in the prospects of the nation. Despite of every possible disadvantage which partisan hostility could create, one party stands pre-eminent, and has succeeded during a period of office in establishing on a still firmer basis its old reputation for carrying out a system of government worthy of a great people flourishing in an enlightened age. Its traducers have been obliged to confess that it has

[1] We particularly recommend to the reader the speech of Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, Bart., on the second reading—a truly statesmanlike exposition of the subject in all its relations, that fully maintains the administrative reputation he established when a member of the Cabinet.

deserved the national confidence; and in the first emergency there can scarcely remain a doubt how this confidence will be shown.

— The Radicals have been diminishing in power. Ever since the special constables established the power of the middle and upper classes to protect themselves, the Chartist demonstrations have ceased; and the new police, notwithstanding the abuse with which they commenced their political career during the Reform era, have become a domestic institution, appreciated by every one possessed of property to protect.

A calm review of the state of affairs at home and abroad will afford the Government little for congratulation, and less for hope. Their finances are in a difficulty from which their very able Chancellor of the Exchequer will find it almost impossible to extricate them; and we are arming against an ally who professes the most friendly commercial relations, while maintaining enormous armaments that threaten our commerce more seriously than did the decrees of Napoleon I. France having at last succeeded in getting rid of her "Citizen King," after a faint attempt at a republic based on universal suffrage, re-established a more absolute monarchy than that of Russia, in favour of the adventurer of Strasburg and Boulogne. Abroad we can find little to brighten the gloom of our home prospect, except the termination of the Chinese War, for which we cannot be too thankful. We shall be

extremely glad to be out of the New Zealand War with a tithe of the credit Lord Elgin has earned.

In Italy there are abundant sources of disquiet. The Austrian difficulty has been a fruitful parent; for though the knot was divided with the sword, the severed pieces have got into an inextricable tangle. What is to be done with the Pope, who is supported by a French army against united Italy; what is to be done with the King of Naples, who cannot find support in any direction, will probably be settled before these pages are printed. Then there are the Duchies, Venice, and various other elements of discord, which neither the patriotism of Garibaldi, the ambition of Victor Emmanuel, nor the military genius of Napoleon III., seem likely to bring into harmonious combination.

Turning to the East, we find "the sick man" more sick than ever; and his too anxious friend again exhibiting his anxiety, probably aware that he shall this time be permitted to provide for his funeral, on condition of sharing his effects with one of his guardians who interposed, on the previous occasion, to prevent the fulfilment of his ill-disguised intentions. The recent massacres of the Christians in Syria indicate the feebleness of his condition. Whether we shall attempt to perform the duties of guardianship single-handed, or be content to play the part of the good Samaritan of nations after our ancient ally has been left by his assailants, remains to be seen; but it is not impro-

bable that work will be found for us elsewhere. A new arrangement of the map of Europe has been contemplated, and as the alteration of boundaries has already commenced, it is impossible to say where it will end. The Syrian occupation may be as lasting as that of Rome. The ancient Government of Austria is not in much better condition than that of Turkey, and apprehensions of an impending insurrection in Hungary pervade the entire Continent. A knowledge of the immense armaments created in France for some particular purpose, has produced the Volunteer movement in England, as well as a desire throughout the kingdom for placing it in an efficient state of defence.

Our confidence in the good sense of the people of England is equal to our reliance on their patriotism, which has carried them bravely through many a hard struggle; and this enables us to look forward with little fear that the transparent follies of the Peace Society, and the dangerous theories of the Birmingham politicians, will be suffered in the slightest degree to affect the interests of the empire in the coming crisis.

THE END.

LONDON:
SAVIL AND EDWARDS, PRINTERS, CHANDOS STREET,
COVENT GARDEN.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018